## THE

## REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 4.-OCTOBER 1892.

I.

## THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM.

BY JOHN S. STAHR, D.D.

THERE is not a single mechanical or industrial process that has not felt the influence of the marvelous advance in scientific discovery for which our age is justly celebrated. a single sphere or department of human life that has not been changed and enlarged by the application of new principles in the production and distribution of the things which satisfy human wants or minister to the well-being of man. In the cottage of the poor as well as in the mansion of the rich, in the simple surroundings of the peasant as well as in the complex organizations of city life are found the evidences and the fruit of an advanced civilization that furnishes for the support, the comfort, the amusement, the improvement of man means wrung from reluctant nature by the triumph of human skill and genius such as an earlier civilization could scarcely imagine in its wildest dreams. It is little wonder, therefore, that our educational means and methods should also have felt the influence of this spirit of progress. Indeed the changes which have

422

been effected in the external life of man, in his material surroundings, may be said to have sprung from the advancement in knowledge and experience which is characteristic of man as he develops in the unfolding of his historical life-that is, the life of the race. But progress in this respect consists not simply in the increase of knowledge by virtue of which new and surprising results are produced in the combination and use of the forces of nature. It affects the development of man's spiritual life as well as his relation to nature—not only the acquisition of knowledge, but also the unfolding of mind, the making of the man in the fulness of his powers. Investigation extends not only to the realm of matter, but also to that of mind; discoveries are made not only in the sphere of natural, but also in that of spiritual law; and in either case we find that every point of advantage gained by the enlargement of knowledge is immediately turned to practical account in the way of new methods and improved processes for the accomplishment of the same, or, it may be, more desirable ends. Accordingly we find a New Education, as well as a New Chemistry, and improved methods of teaching, as well as improved processes of tanning. All this is legitimate. There is no reason why a better knowledge of the laws of mind should not be as beneficial in education as the application of electricity is in the new French process of making leather.

Granting, without hesitation, that the age has advanced as rapidly in its intellectual as it has in its material development, there is still room for doubting many of the strong assertions which are made at the present time as to the great improvements effected in educational methods. Not all change is progress; and even where great advantages are gained in any department of human affort, the new order of things may be accompanied by features which prove great drawbacks in the proper adjustment of human relations. There is no doubt that the great improvements which have been made in manufacturing processes by the invention of machinery, the application of scientific discoveries, and the organization of labor in large in-

dustrial establishments have resulted in the cheapening of products so that the things which but a short time ago could be enjoyed only by the wealthy few, are now placed within the reach of persons of very moderate means. But it is not so certain that society as a whole is so much the better off; and it may be that the multiplication of machinery and the division of labor, so beneficial in one direction, have really wrought an injury to society by driving the small producer out of the market, breaking up the old-fashioned apprentice system, and in other ways changing the relations between man and man in a way which entails the loss of self-respect, independence, and concern for the welfare of others. So also in the sphere of education it is very evident that learning is more widely diffused, that the means of obtaining an education are within the reach of even the humblest, and that the field of knowledge has become so greatly enlarged by the intellectual progress of the age and the facilities for instruction so greatly improved by the princely liberality of the founders of colleges and universities, that there is the greatest possible contrast between the means and methods of the present day and those of fifty years ago. And yet there is room for asking the question whether, even if our schools are improved, our facilities multiplied, our attainments increased, and the results of our educational processes enlarged, there may not also be corresponding loss entailed upon us by the systems of which we are so proud. Do improved methods of instruction, better organized schools and training the fruit of which is immediately evident in practical results, necessarily make better MEN?

This question is not raised in a reactionary spirit or with a disposition to ignore or undervalue the advance of scientific thought and educational theory. No educated man, certainly, and especially no educator, can afford childishly to hug the delusion of pet theories or to cling with stubborn pertinacity to the stale traditions of the past simply because they are of the past. No institution of learning that aims to be worthy of the patronage of an intelligent public can afford to ignore the

424

scientific progress of the age, or fail to adopt the improved means of study and the better methods of teaching which the present day affords. It may be freely conceded that the institutions of higher learning which the present day requires, have a much larger problem to deal with than many of them seem to be aware of, and that where formerly a few thousands were supposed to be adequate for equipment and endowment, millions are now needed. It is no doubt still true that in education more depends on the men than on the means. A Mark Hopkins, a Woolsey or a Nevin wields more influence upon the growing mind than all the paraphernalia of college equipment combined. But such men are rare, and even they do not drop from the sky. They are formed by the educational system of their day, and they need adequate means to work with. To suppose, because now and then there is an educator whose power and influence are so striking that every ordinary appliance in the way of building and apparatus sinks into insignificance, that therefore college and university endowments are not needed, is a piece of egregious folly. The argument that a Mark Hopkins makes a university, does well enough when it is important to emphasize the influence of the man in education, but it is pernicious as well as false when it is used as an apology for ignorance, indolence or parsimony. Whatever reason there may be for questioning some of the tendencies of the present day in the field of education, there is no occasion for looking back to the past with regret, or "sighing for the fleshpots of Egypt," even if it is to be feared that we are still wandering in the wilderness and the "promised land" is not yet in

It is not the purpose of the present paper to set forth the shortcomings of the educational systems of the day, and to sound a note of retreat to the ground occupied by our fathers and grandfathers, nor to weep over the treasure expended in the endowment of large institutions of learning, because "the ointment might have been sold for two hundred pence and given to the poor." It is proposed rather to make a candid

inquiry into the present drift of thought and practice to see whether, with all the advantages which the present generation enjoys, there is not also serious loss, and that of a kind that will entail a very damaging train of evils upon the coming generation unless these features of our educational development can be modified, and the current turned in a different direction. At the same time, if there is room for criticising some things in the educational policy of the present, it may not be out of place to call attention to the good features of the earlier system, and especially to emphasize the advantages offered by the old-fashioned Denominational College, which has come to us as a precious inheritance from the days of our fathers.

In the American educational system the college holds the central place. Whether by design or accident such is really the case, and it gives our system a somewhat different organization from that of any other country. This fact has been recognized by those who have made educational systems their special study, and only recently a graduate of one of the German universities compared the German system with the American to the disadvantage of the former; not because the work done is in any way inferior, or that there is a lack of thoroughness, but simply because Germany has no institution of learning that stands for culture pure and simple. In America we are justly proud of our public schools, and our universities are growing with marvelous rapidity. We have no fault to find with the efforts made to advance either the one or the other to the highest possible degree of efficiency. The alarming feature of the case is that the importance of the college is overlooked so that the tendency is to degrade it to the level of the high school, or exalt it to the grade of the university. Between the two there is danger that the real flavor of culture will be lost; that its delicious aroma will be expelled and replaced by a taste strongly commercial. This can be best shown by inquiring a little more closely into the history and present status of the American College.

Such an inquiry may be conducted upon two different lines. We may start from the theoretical or pedagogic standpoint, discuss the different stages of the educational process, and determine in this way the proper scope of the college; or, again, we may begin on the practical side, study the college in its genesis and development and thus learn its present status. It might seem as if these two lines diverged very widely, inasmuch as the college as we find it in its historical development is by no means all that it ought to be on theoretical grounds. But the difference is not as great as might be expected. The forces and influences which have been operative historically have been modified in their action by theoretical considerations, so that in the concrete the college after all fairly approximates its Indeed, if we have any faith in history as a movement out of chaos into order, out of darkness into the light, we shall be able to find evidences of a progressive movement in the growth of the college towards its ideal. The earth is an oblate spheroid, and its shape is accounted for on the supposition that it was at one time a liquid or yielding body which, as it revolved on its axis, necessarily assumed this form. But it has also been shown that a body as hard and rigid as the earth now is, rotating on its axis, and undergoing disintegration on the surface by the action of air and water, would by a series of slow and imperceptible changes, though at first a perfect sphere, gradually become an oblate spheroid. There would be a constant movement of material on the surface towards the equator until equilibrium was established. Institutions of learning, we think, are subject to a similar process of evolution. Not every change is for the better; but there are leveling and adjusting agencies, as well as those that disturb the equilibrium. Influences hostile to the development of the ideal college may change the current of its life; but we have reason to believe that the requirements of sound culture and liberal education will always in the end assert themselves.

The American college, as to its origin and history, is a unique institution. As already intimated, it differs in many

respects from the institutions of learning found in Europe. Although it is named after and resembles in many of its features the college of the English University, it also had from the beginning some of the functions of the University, such as, for instance, the power to confer degrees. Its founders freely determined its functions according to the needs of the hour, and gave it a character in accordance with the historical conditions by which it was surrounded.

It is worthy of remark that, although at the present time the tendency is to establish institutions of learning independently of Church control, and to reduce to a minimum such control in those already established, the first impulse to establish institutions of higher learning in this country proceeded from the bosom of the Christian Church. Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, the College of New Jersey, Amherst, indeed nearly all the colleges and universities of the country whose roots have struck deep into the soil of our national life, came into existence in response to a demand for liberally educated men. This need was most urgently felt in the holy ministry, but there was a call for such men everywhere in what are called the learned professions and the higher walks of life. As in the development of European civilization, the Church did not, as is sometimes charged, repress the cultivation of letters, but on the contrary planted the seeds of culture in the wilderness, in monasteries and schools established by the Church, so in this country, by the same influence, there were planted and nurtured colleges and universities, the influence of which went far to lay the very foundations of our civilization. In both cases, through these agencies, the benign influences of learning were diffused among the people as thistle-down is carried over the fields by the autumn winds. This was the case also, as is well known, in the Reformed Church. As soon as our fathers came to their self-consciousness as a religious denomination. they established first our Theological Seminary, and this, by bringing home to the consciousness of the Church the necessity of a liberal education and a broad culture as an indispensable

condition for the study of theology, carried in its train the establishment of Marshall College at Mercersburg, the oldest college of the Reformed Church. It is not to be supposed that in the establishment of such a college the purpose was simply to provide the preliminary training without which a candidate for the ministry could not properly prepare himself for his hely calling. It is to the credit of our fathers that they had the wisdom to discern the importance of liberal culture in all ranks of life as essential to the making of every man who was to wield a far-reaching influence in the community, or become the successful aspirant for professional honors. Accordingly while the Church, through the generosity of far-seeing, liberal-hearted men, provided for the education of her ministers, she also furnished the means in her college for the training in liberal learning of all who came to her halls, and these, whether in professional life, or business, or the council halls of the nation, became the moulders of thought and the leaders of society in the best sense of the word.

The course of study in the institutions of learning or colleges which were thus established was at first very elementary. Harvard did not offer more than an ordinary High School. But the standard was gradually raised and the scope of instruction enlarged. So in the other colleges. Changes in the curriculum and additions were made according to the surrounding conditions and the needs of the students, under the controlling influence of the pedagogic principles held by those who had the direction of affairs in their hands. But in all cases a distinction was steadily kept in view between the proper work of the college as expressed by the phrase "liberal culture," and technical or professional studies which were taken up after the completion of the undergraduate course and the attainment of the degree of A. B. Very early, however, professional schools became associated with the colleges (in some cases they even preceded them), and thus there was in many cases a gradual enlargement into a university. This ambition to become a university has sometimes had a beneficial effect, but very often the

opposite. As in manufacturing establishments there is economy in the use of power, as well as in the working up of material and the gradation of labor in the case of large plants or the association of several manufactories which use each other's products, so there is inspiration and enthusiasm, a large measure of mutual help and the possibility of using time to better advantage in the association of intellectual workers of different kinds and the union of different schools under one organization as a university. But there is danger also that the distinction between the college proper and the technical school will be lost sight of, and that the peculiar work of the college will be encroached upon and dwarfed. The effect is still worse when colleges assume the name and play the role of a university by multiplying courses of study upon paper, such as Book-keeping, Type-writing, Music, Painting, etc., without the means or equipment to prosecute effectively the advanced courses which really belong to the university. Very often, to secure patronage by catering to the impatient, utilitarian, mercenary spirit of the age, courses are established which run parallel with the courses in the liberal arts, which, in so far as they include technical studies, displace or interfere with the discipline which the genuine college ought to give, and are therefore a source of weakness rather than of strength. The arrangement of studies in courses has a great deal in its favor; but whenever it serves to set aside real discipline, and substitute technical skill for culture, its consequences must be disastrous.

If by education we mean the making of the man, it is, in the wide sense of the word, a life work. But we usually make a distinction between the fitting of a man for his work and his subsequent career. The formation of character is begun in the former, but it continues in the latter until the hidden genius of the man is brought to view and perfected. Education, therefore, is properly speaking such a training of a man's powers as will enable him to use every talent to the best advantage and make every incident of life minister, not to the acquisition of wealth, the conquest of nature, the gaining of preëminence

430

among his fellows, but to the perfection of his own being and the advancement of the race.] This may sound chimerical or antiquated. But it includes everything else; and even what the world calls success is bound up with the realization of this lofty ideal. Let this be lost sight of, and the dearest interests of life must perish; let this be realized, and life will yield not only "sweetness and light," but also the highest order of mental power, the widest grasp of knowledge, the richest measure of material prosperity. For the path by which such an end is reached lies not above the clouds, but immediately before us. Daily contact with the world and the struggles of practical life are the conditions, laid down by God Himself, by means of which our powers are perfected. But these are the means only. The cause lies higher. Happy he, who enters upon life with a lofty ideal and whose toil is ennobled by the consciousness that the victor is greater than the victory, because the victor is the embodiment of that by which the victory was made possible.

If now we look at the process by which a man is fitted for his work, we find that it consists of three easily distinguished parts. The whole process rests upon two fundamental principles : First, that all growth, physical, intellectual and moral, results from the exercise of faculty. Secondly, that every exercise of a faculty exerts a reflex influence, and the impression made by it persists in the mind. If the mind is to grow, therefore, it must be active, not passive; and as it acts, so will it be. It is the principal, if not the only merit of the new education that it recognizes this truth and seeks to make the child an inquirer or investigator from the beginning-a learner not simply by the exercise of memory, but by the use of every power upon its appropriate object. First of all we have elementary instruction, which includes the training of the senses, the acquisition of knowledge by their use, and the mastery of the rudiments of learning. In this way the door that communicates between the world within and the world without is opened. This is the work of the elementary school including the high school and academy. It ought to furnish both discipline to the mind and

knowledge of the world such as all men ought to have in every condition of life. What this ought to include can be readily seen by a reference to Dr. Dwight's excellent paper on "Education in Boyhood."

Taking this for granted, it is very evident that beyond this there must be a process of special training by which a man is fitted for his particular calling. It may be received in the workshop or the counting-house, in the technical school or the university; but if the calling requires skilled labor or professional knowledge, some special training there must be. With-

out it the most brilliant man is only a quack. I

These, now, are the two extremes of the educational process. and between them lies the true sphere of the college. The universal experience of educators on the one hand and of practical life on the other proves that an elementary education is an inadequate preparation for professional studies or the development of a man's powers to the degree required for the highest order of success. Room must be made for higher education, a process which not only enlarges the field of knowledge and strengthens the mental powers in the farther prosecution of study, but also enlarges and liberalizes the mind and gives it power to survey the world from a higher point of view. There is the same difference in the appearance of the world to an uneducated and an educated man, as there is between the appearance of a landscape under the shadow of the clouds and its appearance when illuminated by the sun. It is the office of the college, therefore, to furnish the mind with knowledge, to discipline and cultivate, to exalt and glorify every power of body and soul, to make the educated man, to impart that indefinable something which is the mark at once of strength and of enlarged freedom of soul.

We have said that the so-called new education lays stress on the mind's activity upon its appropriate objects. It begins right, but just here it also frequently becomes one-sided and defective in that it does not recognize the necessity of a higher development in which the mind's action is none the less real, but the object is no longer without but within the mind; that is, the mind must learn to contemplate truth, not only in its concrete or outward expression, but also in its abstract or spiritual relations. There are deeper relations than those of external things; there are general truths and principles which the mind must also learn to grasp before it can be fully free. In other words, in the process of liberal education the mind must be unsensed just as in moral culture it must be unselfed, and higher education must lead to this result.

This is the special province of the college. Its culture must be broad and liberal, including the discipline of every faculty and the traversing of every field of knowledge. The university, on the contrary, although it carries its investigations much farther, and therefore seems, at first sight, to offer much more to the student, really contracts the field to the individual learner, and its discipline is accordingly narrow and special. We find no fault with this, certainly, if such teaching is preceded by a broad and liberal culture; but it cannot, with safety, be substituted for the training which the college ought to give. It is the college that leads the mind into universal truth-truth as it lies before us in the constitution of nature, truth as it is written upon the human heart and comes to view in speech and action, truth as it is embodied in the constitution of man's religious nature seeking for the light of divine revelation. And in the apprehension of such many-sided truth, the mind becomes enlarged and free.

In this whole process growth is by the exercise of faculty. There is not a discipline in the whole curriculum of study that does not mean real work and contact with living truth. It has been charged that in the college the mind is fed upon husks instead of real knowledge. But, certainly, there is no force in the charge, unless the teacher has mistaken his calling. Our contention is that the real teacher is also an inquirer, and he leads his pupil to the acquisition of knowledge by the use of his own powers, and whether the subject matter be language or history or chemistry or algebra, both teacher

and pupil are investigating, and this process leads to the living truth.

Such education includes the training of the body. The legitimate practice of athletics not only serves to keep the body in good condition, but it also strengthens it. It not only opens a harmless way for the escape of surplus energy; but it also imparts discipline of a high order. At the same time it is to be borne in mind that the body is a means only, the servant of the soul. To cultivate it for its own sake, and to regard physical strength as heroic is worse than folly, because it is a perversion of the gifts of God, The body is the medium only through which the mind acts, and its perfection is to be sought for in order that it may be a perfect medium. The cultivation of the mind, for its own sake, must therefore be the central feature of all college discipline, as we have already described it. It is important to add, however, that even this, in itself, would be imperfect if it did not rest upon and proceed from a moral and religious basis. A colorless education which sets aside religion and concerns itself only with the study of the different branches of learning is not possible, because it either assumes a form which is hostile to religion, or else it is confessedly imperfect, and cannot stand as the training of the whole man.

The late Bishop Bowman well said at the inauguration of the first president of Franklin and Marshall College: "The education which you here propose to impart is to be a sanctified education, education refined, and elevated by religious influence. You, Mr. President, allow me to say, and the gentlemen associated with you, have no legitimate place in a seminary of education, except as along with the seeds of human learning, you aim to implant also the infinitely more important truths of revealed religion. Nor need the best friend of this institution care how soon it perishes down to its foundation stone, when Christian voices cease to be heard and Christian influences to prevail in it."

This theory of college education, as briefly set forth, is

threatened with danger from two different sides. We have already said that the American college is a unique institution. It is not the full equivalent of the German gymnasium, for it goes beyond the latter in its curriculum of studies. It is not on the same plane as the universities of the Old World, for its work is not special, but of a general character. It includes the pure discipline of the gymnasium with the addition, in the

higher classes, of certain university studies.

The first source of danger is from the practical side. The age in which we live is one of rapid development, and has but little patience with the cumbersome methods of former days. The haste which is everywhere manifest in our American life also makes its influence felt in our educational systems, and demands a shortening of the course of study or the period of preparation for active life, and on all sides we see the evidences of unrest and eagerness to leap over barriers into a practical career. Hence the effort is made either to shorten the college course, as for instance, to allow the work of four years to be crowded into three, or else to introduce technical or professional studies into the college course at the expense of other necessary means of culture or discipline. Either method will work serious harm unless it is possible to secure better preparation for the proper discipline of the college, and thus leave room for more and better work on the part of the student.

On the other hand there is danger that, looking at the subject from the purely theoretical standpoint, injustice may be done by a too rigid adherence to the old course of study, or a failure to adapt the course to changed conditions resulting from improved methods of work, the enlargement of the field of knowledge, or new demands made upon our institutions of learning by the progress of society.

A college that deserves the name must have a theory of education, and maintain its principles, if need be, in the face of opposition from any quarter. It cannot sell its educational birthright for the mess of pottage of popular applause. But neither can it stand aloof from the current of life that sur-

rounds it or the thought of the age in which it lives. It must be in living, loving sympathy with all that is best and most progressive in the theory and method of educational thought, and thus bring its power to bear in shaping the educational movements of the day, while at the same time it is open to every legitimate influence that comes back to it from its surroundings.

While, therefore, it is our firm conviction that the college is a means for thorough liberal culture, we believe at the same time that the end in view does not require absolute and rigid uniformity. At the outset, so far as a course of liberal study is concerned, all begin in the same way and pursue the same branches of study, and these, in the nature of the case, are prescribed by the college authorities, not chosen by the students. Here there is no room for question or doubt. But it does not follow for this reason that the same rigid uniformity must be maintained throughout. For, in the first place, the minds which undergo this process of discipline are not all alike, and when, as they become more mature, the differences of taste and capacity become manifest, it is by no means clear that better results cannot be reached by allowing some room for choice, or at least a difference of allotted work in the latter part of the course. Again, the field of knowledge in these days has become so extensive that it is by no means as easy as formerly to give it a general survey, while the demands of the different professions have increased to such an extent that, while training in the college ought still to be for discipline and general culture, it seems desirable that it should include now more here, now more there, with a view to adequate preparation for the special line of work to be pursued afterward.

Even the more conservative colleges of the country, like Yale and Princeton, recognize these facts, and make room for elective studies in the latter part of their course. This does not mean the elimination of any study or discipline that now belongs to the course; it simply means a certain range of variety in each, a maximum and a minimum of work required

or allowed in every department to satisfy what may be regarded the necessities of each individual case. Putting the aspirants for entrance into the different professions or avocations upon the same level, assuring to each a generous liberal culture, and recognizing the natural differences between minds in taste and capacity, such a system would open the way for the solution of many a perplexing problem, and in education, as in Christianity, there would be neither male nor female, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.

appearance of the second of th

Surface process of the control of th

with the contract of the second of the secon

there is the defeat. It said the said to be a selected as a second

gas I mann mengapak padapan sebagai kembanan kembanan kembanan kembanan kembanan kembanan kembanan kembanan be Salah Perunangan mengapan berasah Salah Sa

## THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

BY THE REV. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

THIS subject is one of equal importance and difficulty. On one hand it touches the foundation. For among the earliest questions in theology is the Rule of Faith, and nothing can be decided respecting doctrine or practice until we have reached a final authoritative standard of truth. Such a standard all the Reformed churches declare to be given in the Old Testament and the New. But if this position is to be maintained, it must be shown that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that not figuratively nor vaguely, but in such sense as justly to carry with them the whole weight of the Infinite Mind. Anything short of this involves the entire subject in confusion and complexity. If the standard be not fixed, how can we possibly adjust what we apply to it? Whatever importance, therefore, attaches to the Rule of Faith-confessedly a fundamental point -equally attaches to the question of Inspiration. On the other hand, the subject is peculiarly difficult. For while all Christians acknowledge the Bible to be the word of God, yet when we go beneath the surface and ask in what sense it is the word of God or inspired, the answers vary widely, and indeed always have varied, even among those altogether agreed on other points. Nor do we get any aid from the Creeds and Confessions of old, those precious symbols in which the faith and experience of former generations are formulated. While these all imply more or less distinctly a plenary inspiration, they do not directly express it. No definitions are on record; even in the dogmatic expositions which sprang up in the second 438

century of the Reformation, there are no essays which would be generally accepted now as precise and adequate statement of the doctrine. Nay, more; in works which were current thirty or forty years ago, there are positions taken and distinctions made which are generally, if not universally, disowned

among scholars at the present day.

The difficulties of the subject may be seen from two works of the present generation. In the "Aids to Faith," published in 1861, as a reply to the famous Essays and Reviews, the paper on this subject, contributed by no less a man than Harold Browne, the late bishop of Winchester, says distinctly, " It seems pretty generally agreed among thoughtful men at present that definite theories of inspiration are doubtful and dangerous." So in the lectures on the evidences of Christianity, delivered before the Union Theological Seminary in New York in 1867 by Rev. A. Barnes, occurs this passage: " I said that there are great questions about inspiration which are yet unsettled. I repeat, on account of its importance, and with the hope of stirring up some young man of this seminary to the task, the remark I have already made, that in my judgment there is no one department of Christian literature to which a young man could better devote himself than the solution of those questions. They are beyond my range now, beyond my learning, my ability, and I should not attempt to enter upon them. What is inspiration at all? What is plenary inspiration? Is it suggestion, or superintendence, or control, or all combined? In inspiration how far are the faculties of the men themselves employed? Were they kept from error on all subjects? In what sense was what they wrote on common matters inspired? To what extent in the Book is the Spirit of God 'responsible' for the statements made? And how can the dates, and the genealogies, and the apparent inconsistencies and contradictions, be reconciled with the proper idea of inspiration? These are questions in many of their bearings yet to be solved, and happy will be the man who shall be raised up to solve them." Notwithstanding these discouraging statements, it may be possible to render some aid toward the attainment of definite views on the entire subject.

I. WHAT IS PRESUPPOSED. That the Scriptures are genuine and authentic, i. e., credible historical documents. For we prove the inspiration by the credibility, and not the latter by the former. The great buttresses of the credibility of the Scriptures are the external evidences of miracle and prophecy; the internal, consisting in the majesty, harmony, originality and purity of their contents; and the experimental, as shown by their adaptedness to all the spiritual wants of man's nature. Any candid consideration of these lines of argument must lead to the conviction that the Bible is neither a forgery nor a myth, but a true, trustworthy book. Further, its component parts are supposed to be ascertained, i. e., that it consists of certain writings and no more. In other words its canonical authority is established. The Bible consists of the 39 books of the Old Testament and the 27 of the New; and the entire discussion is confined to them and to them only. The question is, are these writings inspired of God, and if so, in what sense? The gist of the inquiry lies in the latter clause.

II. SOURCE OF OUR KNOWLEDGE. This is the Scriptures themselves. Whether we could ascertain the fact of their inspiration without their own testimony on the point, is, to say the least, very doubtful. Certain it is we are not shut up to such inferential reasoning, but have the most abundant assertions of a divine origin all through the sacred volume.

It is not necessary to quote in detail the affirmations of the Old Testament as to its own origin, for that ground is fully covered by the precise statements of the New. Our Saviour appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures as containing the words of eternal life, and sanctioned them all as arranged by the Jews in the three-fold division of the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, and again and again quoted them as the express word of God. The Apostle Paul declared that all Scripture was given by inspiration of God. And it will make ne difference if we adopt the view taken by the authors of the Revised Ver-

sion and transfer theopneustes from the predicate to the subject, and read "every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable, etc." for in this case the affirmation is equally strong that the

Bible is divinely inspired.

So the Apostle Peter says that "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, (i. e. origin), but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." These passages are conclusive as to the Old Testament, but surely the preparatory part of the Bible would not be inspired, and its complement left without such a guarantee. Accordingly we find ample provision made for it. Our Lord promised to the Apostles, the Holy Spirit to "guide them into all the truth, to teach them all things, and to bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them." They claim to have received just this influence-Paul saying (1 Cor. ii. 13), "Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," and John saying: "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the heareth not us. spirit of error." Similar is the whole tone of the New Testa-Yet there is one apparent exception-in 1 Cor. vii. 12, where Paul says, "To the rest speak I, not the Lord"where some foolishly suppose the Apostle distinguishes between what is inspired and what is not, whereas the connection shows that he distinguishes only between what the Lord had taught while on earth, and what Paul was now inspired by the Holy Spirit to teach. On the general subject of marriage Christ had spoken, and therefore Paul cites his words (in vs. 10, 11); but as to mixed marriages (between Christian and heathen) the Saviour had not laid down any rule, and therefore the Apostle gives a direction in his own words as taught from heaven. So that the passage, instead of weakening, rather confirms the doctrine of the Apostles' Inspiration-inasmuch as it puts their utterances on a par with those of their Master.

III. THE REAL QUESTION.—Here then we come face to face with the real question. All who are in any sense Christians

acknowledge the fact of Inspiration, but in what sense, to what extent, under what limitations, and how is the truth to be stated? The reason of these inquiries is obvious. For the Bible is the book of man as well as of God. A small part of it—the terwords—was once written by a Divine finger on the tables of stone, but all the rest has come to us through human agency. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved." There is then both a divine and a human element in it—but in what proportions? Where are we to run the boundary line between these two factors? How shall we avoid sacrificing one to the other? How shall we frame a theory which will give each its due place and importance, and yet meet all the facts in the case? Before attempting an answer to these queries, it is best to look at the course of opinion in the past.

The Jewish Church held the highest possible doctrine on the subject. The Rabbins believed not only in the direct suggestion by God of every verse and word, but even that a mystery lurked in every abnormal state of letter, jot or tittle. This view stripped of Rabbinical refinements passed into the Christian Church, and was held by nearly all the Fathers. Clement and Origen clearly assert a verbal inspiration, and Chrysostom and Jerome, although more critical in their attainments, and more conscious of the presence of the human element, were yet firmly persuaded of the agency of a controlling Spirit. Nor does this doctrine seem to have been questioned until the age of Abelard, whose adventurous spirit swerved from the common faith here as in other deep questions of Theology. And after him the prevalence of mysticism—an ecstatic vision of things to which the state of the times offered a strong temptation, naturally led those who gave way to it, to overlook the distinction between the inspiration of Apostles and the enlightenment of the Christian soul. Still no definite theory was propounded, and other questions absorbed the general interest.

All this changed at the epoch of the Reformation. The question then came into the foreground where it has ever since remained. Here we find the two tendencies at work under

which may be conveniently arranged all the varying shades of opinion on the subject. These are the exaggeration on one hand of the divine side, and on the other of the human side, of the doctrine of inspiration.

IV. Exaggeration of the Divine Element.-Naturally we observe in the first instance a disposition to dwell unduly on the Bible as a work of God. It could not well be otherwise. The Reformers, rejecting the Romish theory of the infallibility of the church, were compelled to find some other depository of infallibility, and they fell back on the Scriptures as the unerring arbiter of truth, and as alone sufficient for salvation. This indeed very soon became the watchword of the entire movement. Thus they were led to emphasize in the strongest manner the whole word of God as an immediate utterance of divine inspiration. This was often stated as if the several writers of Scripture were nothing more than the penmen of the Divine Spirit, under whose control, they vibrated as the strings of a harp in the hands of an artist. They were just like a piece of mechanism touched by God Himself. An external mechanical force suspended the independent play of the inspired man's faculties, and he was a passive instrument, or at least a mere vehicle of a higher power.\* This theory was very variously expressed by different writers, but in general it maintained that each and every word in the Scripture, and the order and arrangement of the words, had been supplied and dictated by the Holy Ghost. But this external view is liable to many objections.

(1) It makes no allowance for the individuality of the sacred writers. Nothing is more evident than that they spoke and wrote, each according to his language, country, age, character, training, associations and pursuits. Any two of them differ just as much in these respects as any two authors who lay no

<sup>\*</sup> Even Augustine said, "We cannot say that Christ wrote nothing, since the Apostles were merely His hands in writing," (Smith, H. B.) and one of the Reformers, that the "Sacred writers were not the penmen, but the pen of the Holy Ghost."

claim to inspiration. Who can be more unlike than Job and Solomon, or Isaiah and Jeremiah, or Paul and James, or Peter and John? The differences here are original and wide, and no view of the subject which denies or ignores them can be admitted. They cannot be explained by the differences in the sound of a musical instrument according to the skill or purpose of those who play on it. For here the diversities are plainly in the men themselves. They existed before they were inspired and remained afterwards. Besides, there is in many cases the most distinct exhibition of the personality and consciousness of these men, e.g., in the private experiences given in the Psalms, and in the Epistles. It is vain to think of regarding these as created for the occasion by a power standing outside of the writers. We feel instinctively that they must have sprung from the circumstances in which the writers were placed, and are the natural actings of their own minds.

(2) Another difficulty in the way of this theory is that it necessarily attributes to God what we know He abhors, e.g., the lies that Satan told to Eve, the cruel misrepresentations of Job which were made by his friends, the objections stated for refutation in Ecclesiastes, and in the argumentative Epistles of Paul. All these are in Scripture and a part of Scripture, and very important to be known, but they ought not to be and cannot be called the immediate utterances of God. And any theory which makes them such, however it may design to save the divine honor, does in reality expose it to the most serious reproach.

(3) Another objection is that this view makes all Scripture, not only instructive and useful which is the truth, but also all instructive and useful in the same manner and to an equal degree, which is very far from being true. The genealogies in I. Chronicles serve a very important purpose, but they are not to be compared in value with the Sermon on the Mount. The moral maxims of Solomon are a great storehouse of practical wisdom, yet they fall far below the sublimity and pathos of the evangelical prophet. The biographies in the Old Testament are full

of instruction, yet all of them together do not equal the one great biography which opens the New Testament. Manifestly our theory of inspiration must be one that will allow for these diversities in importance.

These and like difficulties were early seen to burden the doctrine which makes everything of the Divine factor and nothing of the human. There was therefore a reaction in the opposite direction.

V. Exaggeration of the Human Side.—This began among the Socinians and Arminians of the 17th century, but soon extended far beyond them. The general ground assumed here is that the Scriptures do indeed contain a revelation from God and so far are inspired, but the writers, being human and imperfect, were liable to error and in fact did err. This was stated in different ways.

(1) One ground taken was that the religious teachings were truly God's utterances, but the narrative portions were the product of men's own powers and studies, and that these must very naturally be subject to mistake. A distinction very like that of the Romish doctors in regard to the Pope's infallibility. He cannot err in questions of faith or morals, but as to matters of fact or science he is fallible as other men. But, however this may answer for the claims of his Holiness, it fails entirely in the question we are considering. In the Scripture the dogmatic and historical statements are inextricably interwoven with each other, and must stand or fall together. For example, the fall of the first man and the consequent depravity of the race is a fact as well as a doctrine, and the rejection of the former logically implies that of the latter. If the account of what occurred in Eden is a myth, the Scripture view of sin is sadly mutilated or rather utterly disjointed. So in reference to the person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. The stupendous doctrine of the Incarnation is a historical fact, stated with utmost precision as to time, place and circumstances. If there be error in the narrative, there must be equal error in the theological views founded upon it or identified with it. But in

truth what intelligent basis can there be for this distinction between directly religious and other teachings? If the writers were correct in announcing heavenly things, would they not a fortiori be correct in relating earthly things? Why should they be infallible in the more important and difficult matters and exposed to error in the easier and more ordinary?

(2) Another escape from difficulties has been devised in the theory that only the thoughts of revelation are inspired, but the shaping and clothing of them in words has been left to the human agents employed. This seems to be founded upon a confusion between revelation and inspiration which will hereafter be noticed. The Scripture is the record of a revelation from God. How can a record be made without words? It is not necessary here to take the extreme ground of some, and say that there can be no thought without language. The cases of infant children and of deaf mutes sufficiently disprove any such hypothesis. Nay indeed so far from thought depending upon words, it often quite outstrips them, as when the Apostle speaks of groanings which cannot be uttered, or of a gift or a joy which is unspeakable. But when the question respects not the exercise, but the communication of thought, the case is altered. How are we to know the thoughts of another except by the language in which they are clothed?

Those thoughts obtain all their precision, definiteness and clearness, from the verbal statements in which they are conveyed. Hence in all true and just writing the thought and the word are wedded together indissolubly as the soul and body in human nature. Surely such is the fact in all the great masterpieces of poetry, oratory and philosophy. How will you separate Milton's conceptions from his dislect even if Johnson did call it "Babylonish," or the rush of Demosthenes's eloquence

from the winged words which uttered it?

The Scriptures themselves know nothing of this severance between the conceptions and the expression of inspiration. They speak always of the words of God. They quote and argue from them, sometimes even for a single word—as in the case of a singular noun instead of a plural in Gal. iii. 10. Nor indeed do they ever speak of the thoughts, or sentiments or doctrines of the Scripture, separately from the language. It is the writings themselves to which the inspiration attaches. Indeed, on any other theory, we should need an additional revelation to guide us in discerning how much of the Old Bible is divine thought, and how much human word. But in truth, Inspiration is the organizing principle of the whole book, just as life is the organizing energy in the bodily frame, extending to the brains of the head as well as to the beating of the heart. It comprises both the matter and the form; the matter in the form in which it is conveyed and set forth. It extends to the language, not in any mechanical sense, but in the sense that, under divine guidance, each writer spake in his own language according to the measure of his knowledge, however acquired. All spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Thus that blessed Spirit works in all parts of the Bible, making out of its many and varied elements one divine work, God's book, given by men and for men.

3. The most prevalent form in our day of exaggerating the human element in Inspiration, is that of making it a purely subjective process.

This tendency first appeared in the mystics of the Middle Ages. It is a natural result of the belief in an ecstatic vision of things divine in which constant revelations are made to the soul. This is essentially different from the common doctrine that the Holy Ghost dwells in and with the Church to enlighten and instruct and guide humble believers. It is one thing to enable us to understand and appropriate revealed truth already existing, and another to make to us fresh disclosures in new directions. This latter was the error of the mystic. He thought he was transported out of himself and had supernatural communion with God. His soul therefore was in a condition of constant inspiration. The intuitions of his spirit enabled him to see things invisible. Of course then he was in no respect less favored than the penmen of the Scriptures, and

their inspiration was no more than his own, viz., a certain vivid illumination of the devout mind.

Mysticism reappeared after the Reformation, in the Anabaptists, the Quakers and others, and with much the same result. The mystic has an infallible guide in his own bosom who not only opens his understanding that he may understand the Scripture, but communicates truth sensibly and directly to the soul. Thus e. g. the leading principle of George Fox and the early Friends was the doctrine of the Inward Light common to every man. This they claimed to be the true principle of all religious knowledge. Every thing else must be subordinated to the light of God within the soul. Even the outward word was valuable chiefly as it stirred up the word within. Manifestly on this view there is no distinction between the inspiration of prophets and apostles, and that of every true believer. The orthodox Quakers have long since quietly dropped this extreme view.

The same point was reached in a different way by the celebrated Schleiermacher, whose influence over his own and the succeeding generation was so marked. His view of inspiration was the direct corollary of his fundamental principle-that there was no immediate intervention of God in the history of the world, save in two instances: one the creation of man; the other, the constitution of the person of Christ. This of course takes all the supernatural out of the Bible. The Old Testament had nothing which the nature derived from Adam was not able to produce, and the New had nothing which the life common to all believers was not sufficient to account for. Christianity in his view was not a doctrine but a life. In the incarnation God did not take upon Him a true body and a reasonable soul, but generic humanity. The effect was to unite the human and divine as one life. And this life passes over to the Church by a process of natural development, just as Adam's life did to his descendants. Participation of this divine-human life makes a man a Christian.

Now the men who, at the time of Christ's appearance upon

earth, came most directly under His influence, enjoyed a peculiar elevation of the religious consciousness. This subjective state, this excitement of a higher life, gave them intuitions of religious truth, eternal verities. And these intuitions were afterward clothed in the form of doctrines. And this is what is meant and all that is meant by inspiration.

The influence of Schleiermacher was felt by Coleridge, whose opinions, suggested in his earlier writings, were distinctly set forth in a posthumous work, "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," marked with all his splendor of diction and looseness of thought. The treatise is a glowing protest against the mechanical theory of inspiration which he represents as the prevailing view, viz., "That all that exists in the sacred volume was not alone composed by men under the actuating influence of the Holy Spirit, but likewise dictated by an infallible intelligence," and again, that "all the nominal composers of the Hebrew nation before the time of Ezra, of whom there are any remains, were successively transformed into automatic compositors—so that the original text should be in sentiment, image, word, syntax and composition, an exact impression of the divine copy." Coleridge rings the changes on these views in every possible form, and then in his recoil falls back upon a theory hardly more rational. In his pet phrase: "In the Bible there is more that finds me than I have experienced in all other books put together; the words of the Bible find me at greater depths of my being; and whatever finds me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit." But what as to such portions as do not find him? He nowhere expressly says that such portions are not inspired, but his whole discussion implies it. So that we are thrown back simply upon our own individual consciousness. Whatever in Scripture meets our individual wants is from God in the proper sense-whatever does not, is merely the result of His providential direction, and comes to us with no authority at all. A looser or more worthless theory could hardly be devised. It strips the Bible of its claim to be an unerring rule of faith, and makes every man's

consciousness the test of truth. Or, as the Bishop of Winchester says: "If we go on this principle where are we to stop? If we read the Second book of Chronicles perhaps we may discover very little which 'finds' us; whereas if we read Baxter's Saints' Rest, it may find us in nearly every page. To carry out Coleridge's principle, we ought to uncanonize or reject as inspired the book of Chronicles, and set up as canonical and inspired the book of Baxter."

The prevalent English application of Schleiermacher's views may be stated in this way. God made a revelation of Himself to the world in Jesus Christ, but it was the inspiration of the Apostles which enabled them clearly to discern it. The proper idea of this inspiration, however, does not include either miraculous powers, verbal dictation, or any distinct commission from God. "It does not imply anything generically new in the actual processes of the human mind, nor does it involve any form of intelligence essentially different from what we already possess. It indicates rather the elevation of the religious consciousness, and with it, of course, the power of spiritual vision, to a degree of intensity peculiar to the individuals thus highly favored of God." Thus in any and every case in which the moral nature is highly purified, and the spiritual being is brought into harmony with the mind of God, there is nothing to prevent or disturb the immediate intuition of divine things. The theory is one which is calculated to mislead, because it carefully preserves much of the phraseology of Scripture, while yet in realify it overthrows the whole foundation of the Gospel.

The objections to it are :

1. Its misconception of Religion. The theory makes religion to consist in feeling—the feeling of absolute dependence, i. e., the consciousness that the finite is nothing in the presence of the Infinite. All forms, therefore, of this emotion are alike true, although not equally pure, nor equally adequate in their modes of expression. The worship of Baal and the worship of Jehovah were substantially the same thing, differing in acci-

dents and manifestation, but not in root and essence. The Bible is totally opposed to this. It everywhere assumes that there can be no holiness without truth. It traces the idolatry and immorality of the heathen world back to their ignorance of God. Men did not like to retain Him in their knowledge, and hence their degradation and ruin. The duty therefore of the first teachers of Christianity was to set forth a system of doctrines, and by manifestation of the truth commend themselves to every man's conscience. They cared nothing for feeling, except as it was produced by knowledge of the truth. And they held those and only those to be Christians who accepted their doctrinal statements as true, and exhibited a corresponding state of heart and mode of life. A holy unbeliever and an unholy believer were to them a contradiction in terms.

- 2. Mistaken view of revelation. According to the Scripture God revealed His will to His servants in a direct objective manner. This was done in a variety of ways-by ministering angels, in visible signs and tokens, in voices to the rapt ear, in visions of the night, in deep sleep as to Abram, or mouth to mouth as to Moses, and in prophetic ecstasy-but always as a communication from without the man himself. Consider the express statement of the Apostle Peter, that the prophets "searched what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow "-where there is a sharp discrimination between the author and the recipient of the revelation. But the modern theory supposes that men themselves, through some favoring natural circumstances, providential or religious, but in no sense supernatural, were so exalted in their sensibilities that they could intuitively apprehend the things of God. Such a revelation is no revelation. It is an abuse of terms to call it such.
- 8. It fatally limits the scope of revealed truth. Inspiration, according to it, is simply the mind gazing upon and receiving what are called "eternal verities," i. e., universal and necessary truths, which alone are the objects of intuition. But how

long would it be before any man, no matter how endowed, would, by meditating upon God, evolve the doctrine of a unity of persons in the essence of the Godhead? That is an eternal verity, but certainly one that could never be known but by an objective revelation. But other cardinal and characteristic features of Christianity are not eternal verities at all, e. g., the fall of man, the depravity of the race, the divine-human character of Jesus of Nazareth, the salvation of men by the blood and intercession of our Lord, the resurrection of the same body at the last day. These are truths of the highest moment, and make our religion what it is, but they have no place in man or in nature, they are not in any sense intuitive, and no exaltation of the religious consciousness of man would ever have enabled any man to discover them of himself. And the same remark may be made as to the historical prophecies which are so marked a feature of the Scriptures e. g.: That Abraham should possess Canaan, that his posterity should be bondmen in Egypt, that they should be restored to the promised land, that they should again be captives in Babylon and after 70 years be a second time restored, that Christ should be born of a virgin in Bethlehem, should die on the cross, be buried and yet rise on the third day, that the Jews should reject Him, and in consequence be scattered over the earth and yet be preserved a distinct people. All these were predicted long before they came to pass; but no degree of spiritual elevation could enable a man to foresee them. They do not belong to the class of objects of which the religious consciousness takes notice. To say that an eminently holy man could foreknow such events is as absurd as to say that if a man had a good telescope he could see who is to be President of the United States in 1900.

4. This theory destroys the authority of the Bible as a Rule of Faith. The common doctrine is that, as the Belgic Confession says, "the word of God was not sent or delivered by the will of man, but that holy men of God, etc., and that these holy and divine writings are received for the reg-

ulation, foundation and confirmation of our faith (iii, v) and that whatever does not agree with this infallible rule is to be rejected." (viii). The Bible therefore contains the thoughts of God, and in that character controls our belief. But the modern theory makes it contain only the thoughts of men -holy men and exalted men-and yet men destitute of supernatural aid. If this be so, then they are no authoritative guide. Men's logical understanding clothed in a certain form the intuitions due to their religious feelings. Other men are to judge of this accordingly. If the Scripture seems to them the best expression of their own religious' experience, they will adopt it; if not, not; or perhaps they will take a part and reject the rest. But in any case the reason of their course lies not in the Scripture, but in themselves. Even if they accept the Bible, it is not because it is God's own testimony respecting Himself, but because their own experience confirms it. So it is no rule at all, but a plastic lump to be molded by every man to suit his own notions and caprices.

In truth, this entire theory is from beginning to end opposed to the plain and obvious sense of the Bible. The one great demand of the Gospel is faith, not feeling—faith in the divine truths revealed and proposed for human guidance. The great commission directed the Apostles to go and disciple all nations, teaching them what Christ had commanded; and these apostolic messengers constantly propounded their doctrines as the revealed wisdom of God—standing in sharp contrast with the wisdom of men. If a man received their doctrines and sustained them by a corresponding life, he was a Christian. If on the other hand he rejected them, he was an unbeliever and an heir of perdition. It is then a serious error to make a man's creed of little or no importance, for the Lord Jesus Christ said "He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be condemned."

VI. THE TRUE DOCTRINE. The ground having thus been comparatively cleared, by exposing the errors which have pre-

vailed on one side or the other, it is time now to turn to the positive statement of the truth.

An important and very needful preliminary remark is that Inspiration is to be carefully discriminated from Revelation on one hand, and Spiritual Illumination on the other. It is less than the former and more than the latter. Confusion on this point is fatal to the due apprehension of the subject. Indeed a large portion of the popular objections to the church's doctrine is founded upon the inability to distinguish Revelation from Inspiration. And yet the two things are entirely distinct. They do not in any degree depend upon or imply each other. They proceed from different persons in the Godhead-Christ is the great Revealer; The Holy Ghost inspires. They are not necessarily given to the same persons. One man may have revelations without inspiration, and another have inspiration without revelation. Revelation means the supernatural disclosure of truth not before known\*-Inspiration, the unerring record of that truth or any other, however acquired. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob received many divine communications, teaching them what they could have learned in no other way; but so far as we know, not one of them was inspired to make a written record of these revelations. And our knowledge of the fact comes from a different person altogether. So the Apostle Paul was caught up into the third heaven, and heard unspeakable words, but he was not inspired to record these words, because they were such as it is not lawful for a man to utter. On the other hand we know not that Luke ever enjoyed a revelation, yet he was inspired to make the record called. The Acts of the Apostles. The two things are then altogether distinct, both in conception and actual experience. Yet they are equally necessary for the purposes of the church. For supposing a divine communication to be made, it would be of little or no use with-

<sup>\*</sup>Whether because its subject matter transcends human powers, as prophecy; or because, although knowable in the ordinary way, it was not in fact known to the receiver of the revelation, as in the case of Elisha and the Shunamite, (2 Kings iv. 27).

out an inspired record of it, for otherwise we could have no certainty that the Revelation was correctly transmitted, or even that it was rightly apprehended by the recipients themselves. Yet even eminent men have confounded these things, e. g., Grotius admitted the inspiration of some parts of the Bible, but the histories he said needed no such influence, for it was enough if their writers had good memories, and were careful in their narrative. So Bishop Warburton maintained that it would be "putting the Holy Ghost on an unnecessary employment to suppose that he dictated the historical parts of Scripture, for the writers did not need his immediate assistance, to do this part of their business for them." These writers forgot that it is one thing to impart knowledge, and another to control the communication of that knowledge to others.

But while Inspiration is different from Revelation and less than it, on the other hand, it is different from the gracious illumination common to all believers, and very much more than that. One of the modern forms of error on the subject denies this. Not to speak of the German writers (Twesten, Nitzsch, etc.), Coleridge attributes a large part of the Scripture to "that grace and communion of the Spirit which the church under all circumstances, and every regenerate member is permitted to hope, and instructed to pray for." Dr. Arnold and Archdeacon Hare have written much to the same effect, And Mr. Maurice says that "We must forego the demand we make upon the conscience of young men when we compel them to declare that they regard the inspiration of the Bible as generically unlike that which God bestows upon His children in this day." So F. W. Robertson: "The prophetic power in which I suppose is chiefly exhibited that which we mean by Inspiration, depends almost entirely on moral greatness. The prophet discerned large principles, true for all time-principles social, political, ecclesiastical and principles of life, chiefly by largeness of heart and sympathy of spirit with God's Spirit." (Life II., 145).

We affirm, on the contrary, that there is just this generic difference. There is a real and most important influence of the

Holy Ghost, bestowed upon all Christians, who are renewed, sanctified, led, guided, comforted and taught by the Heavenly Paraclete. But this is specifically different from inspiration, which is confined to a few selected persons. The work of the Spirit on believers as such is altogether subjective and directed to their individual improvement and growth in grace. His work on the authors of the Scripture is altogether objective, and designed for the benefit of the Church. The authority of these writers in no degree depends upon their sinlessness, or even their eminent personal holiness. The design of their inspiration was not at all to render them morally perfect, but to make them in their teaching infallible organs of the truth. That such is the fact is shown, not only by the acknowledged shortcomings of many of these writers, such as David, Solomon, Jonah and Peter, but also by the circumstance that in two instances men without any apparent sanctifying grace, and who lived and died outside of the fold of faith, were yet made the media of signal prophecies-viz. Balaam and Caiphas-cases which would seem to have been providentially ordained, one in the Old Testament and the other in the New, on purpose to afford this distinguishing test of the nature of Inspiration. So, on the other hand, Barnabas was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, and greatly blessed in his work, yet he was not inspired to record the divine will. The same was true of Apollos who was eloquent and mighty in the Scripture, and fervent in spirit, and an able reasoner. Nor do the sacred writers ever base their claims to a hearing, on any subjective excellence of their own, but upon the fact that God spoke through them. They were His messengers, His witnesses, His spokesmen, and therefore their teaching came with the weight of divine authority. To deny it, to take from it, or to add to it, incurred a tremendous anathema. Therefore the Church has always made the broadest distinction between the writings of inspired men and those of ordinary believers, Even Romanists with all their reverence for the fathers, never presumed to place their writings upon a level with the Scriptures. And all the historical churches of the Reformation agree with the Belgic confession—"Neither may we compare any writings of men, though ever so holy, with those divine Scriptures, for all men are of themselves liars and less than vanity itself. Therefore we reject with all our hearts, whatsoever doth not agree with this infallible rule, which the Apostles have taught us, saying, 'Try the Spirits whether they be of God,' likewise 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house.'"

Hence it is obvious to remark that there are:

VII. No DEGREES OF INSPIRATION.—The contrary opinion is of old date, and in Great Britain was for a long time the common mode of representation. Its origin is to be traced to Maimonides, the greatest of the Jewish doctors since the time of our Lord. This learned rabbi was born at Corduba, in Spain, in 1131, and was a pupil of Averroes from whom he gained the knowledge of Aristotle. And his views of Inspiration, it is thought were suggested to him by the Mohammedan philosophers who make subtle distinctions between the Koran and other alleged prophetical writings. Maimonides assigned a pre-eminent position to Moses, who, he said, prophesied, while awake, and not in a dream or vision as others-saw God face to face-and had the gift continuously. After Moses, there were eleven distinct degrees of prophecy which he recounts at length. From these Abarbanel (1437) deduced the three degrees which thenceforward became the accepted Jewish doctrine on the subject. 1. The Mosaic, under which the Law was written. 2. The Prophetical, under which the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, with the major prophets (except Daniel) and all the minor, were composed, and: 3. That of the Holy Spirit, by whose guidance all the rest, called Hagiographa, were written. This Jewish figment, which has absolutely no foundation whatever in the Scriptures, but indeed is in direct opposition to some of its plainest statements, seems to have given rise to the theory of partial Inspiration, maintained by such men as the eloquent Bishop Lowth, the learned

Whitby, the excellent Doddridge, Principal Hill of the Kirk of Scotland, Dr. Dick of the Associate Church, Bishop Wilson of Islington, and the eminent Independent, Dr. Henderson, Some of them make three degrees of Inspiration, others four, and Dr. Henderson, five, which he denominates: 1. A divine excitement. 2. Invigoration or elevation. 3. Superintendence. 4. Guidance. 5. Direct Revelation.

The obvious objections to this view, however stated, are, 1. That it is, at most, a mere hypothesis, without any warrant in Scripture. Nowhere is there a hint of any such diversity of divine influence, but the broad affirmation is, "Every inspired Scripture is also," etc. This and similar passages before quoted, cover the entire contents of the sacred volume, the Old and the New, the matter and the manner, the thoughts and the words, the prose and the poetry, the narratives and the discussions, the leading points and the minor details.

2. This view puts large portions of Scripture under a cloud as destitute of divine authority. Hear so good a man as Bishop Wilson saying, "What the extent of inspiration was in each case, we need not, indeed, we cannot, determine. We infer from the uniform language of the New Testament that in each case such assistance, and only such assistance, was afforded as the exigencies of it required. Where nature ended and inspiration began, it is not for man to say." Of course then there is a part of the Scripture—though no man can say how much or where it is-which is a result of pure nature, and does not carry with it the authority of God at all. If so, we are all at sea, and never know when we stand on solid ground.

3. The idea of degrees of inspiration is absurd. For God's word is infallible because inspired, and how can there be degrees of infallibility? An inspiration to be of any account must be complete, or, as the technical phrase is, plenary. Any limitation of it, just so far as that limitation extends, destroys it, and we pass over from the wisdom of God to the wisdom of

men as the ground of our faith and hope.

VIII. DEFINITION.—Inspiration is a divine influence upon

the sacred writers making their record of revelation infallible throughout in thought and expression. It did not reveal to them anything, but guided them in recording what was revealed. It did not make them perfect or unerring in other things, but only as writers of the Scripture. It was therefore plenary in the just and accurate sense of that term, i. c., it secured the absolute correctness of the record in all its parts, both as to fact and doctrine. In all matters of science, philosophy and history, the authors of Scripture stood on the level of their contemporaries, but when they took in hand the writing of God's revealed will, His Holy Spirit rendered them true and unerring.

But this does not mean that they became mere machines, or that they lost their self-consciousness, or suffered a suspension of any of their intellectual faculties. Instead of being unconscious instruments, it was active, thinking, willing minds that the Holy Ghost used as His organs. And these minds retained all their distinctive individual characteristics. Each writer used the language to which he was accustomed and followed the bent of his own mind, whether it were lyrical like David, or logical like Paul, or emotional and contemplative like John, or didactic like James. We find this to be the case even in prophecy. Isaiah soars to heaven in flights of unequalled sublimity, while Haggai and Malachi creep on the ground in a serene and unimpassioned course. The herdman Amos wanders in the pastures, and draws his similitudes from the mildew on the vine, or the lion invading the fold, or the starry skies beneath which the shepherd feeds his flocks. The gorgeous symbolism of Chalden is reflected in every page of Ezekiel and Daniel, while Jeremiah, a prophet of priestly race, has ever before him the various features of the Theocracy—the temple, the altar and the ark. Much more must this be the case in the other forms of Inspiration. The writers retain all the features of genius, character, thought and feeling, which belong to them by nature, or result from their several social positions. God used them as His organs-each according to His peculiar gifts and endowments. They wrote out of the fullness of their own thoughts and feelings, and selected such language as seemed appropriate to them. Yet they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and their words were God's words.

Nor did it make any difference as to the source whence the several penmen gained their materials, whether from personal experience, as David; or tradition, as Moses; or historical inquiries, as Luke; or logical argumentation, as Paul; or immediate revelation, as John—in any and all cases an infallible Spirit guided them in the selection and arrangement. So then the Bible is in one sense all human, in another all divine, or better still, it is divine-human. The two elements are united much as they are in the miraculous person of our Lord Jesus Christ. He was fully and certainly man, and at the same time He was fully and certainly God. So the Bible is truly and unquestionably human, and yet truly and unquestionably divine.

This is sometimes pronounced absurd and contradictory, but most unjustly. Cannot God control rational creatures without turning them into machines? If not, then the doctrine of grace, the doctrine of Providence—nay, the doctrine of Theism itself, must be surrendered. But we are left to no such dread alternative. When Joseph's brethren sold him into Egypt they were free yet fulfilled a divine purpose. A soul is never more free than when it turns to God in faith and repentance, yet this is only of grace. The freest agents among all creatures are angels and the spirits of just men made perfect, yet their stability is secured by a divine decree. There is nothing unphilosophical or unscriptural in asserting the entire freedom and naturalness of the penmen of the Scriptures, and at the same time their divine and supernatural guidance.

Such then is substantially the doctrine of the evangelical church at this day. It is a doctrine which, by its mere statement, cuts off a host of difficulties and objections. It gives full and free play to each of the factors which the very name inspiration implies. It accounts for all the facts in the case. It furnishes a steady and uniform basis of faith. It binds all

parts of the sacred volume into one integral and organized whole. It preserves the supernatural element throughout, yet parades no needless miracle, and offers no violence to the reason or the consciousness of thoughtful men.

Consequently, we have the mind and will of God for salvation—the unerring arbiter of all truth and duty—revealed to us in human language, and yet miraculously free from the soiling touch of human depravity. Not more clearly are the heavens in all their majesty and glory the work of God than is that collection of writings which we call the Bible, the word of God. All else may fail, but this shall stand. Heaven and earth may pass, but the word of the Lord abideth forever.

The mean sub-At- are to sent the Yang visit of the Company of the Sangaran Design the transfer of the Company of the Sangaran At-species

Appendig ("Newsy" of "Taring the propolated field and color and the color appeal for the and the color of the color and the color of the color and the color of t

table and experience of the control of the control

The first of the first of the second of the

property of the real with the latest the control of the property of the fill of the second of the se

### III.

#### MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Sufficiency of the August States and the August States and States

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL,

It is not proposed to attempt to treat this subject from a specialist's standpoint, nor in a critical manner. I shall take a practical view of the subject,—such a view as concerns the ministry in its ordinary pastoral services.

Our subject has become the "burning question" of the hour. It may not be ignored by the ministry. The attempt to do so by a minister might have some show of being successfully vindicated were it not that the subject is so closely allied to his work and position, that it does not ignore him. If he does not desire to meet it, it scruples not to cross him at every turn of his path. Its interrogation points everywhere stare him in the face in his Biblical study. The atmosphere he breathes is impregnated with it. Hence every pastor should devote at least as much time as he can to its study. Perhaps all that is possible for the ordinary pastor, with his rounds of pastoral and preaching work, is that he endeavor to inform himself of the "results" of this study, as fast as they are announced by specialists whose time and inclination and possibly duties and positions force them to pay close attention to "processes." And yet, to do even this intelligently it is necessary to know somewhat of these processes. Look upon it, therefore, from whatever view we may, it cannot but become our duty, to look carefully at the subject under consideration.

I have worded the subject advisedly as "Modern Biblical Criticism." There is a marked difference between what is generally termed "Biblical Criticism," and what is understood by the term "Modern Biblical Criticism." The former means a general critical study, be it either in so-called higher or lower criticism of the Scriptures, for the purpose of learning the truth in regard to the integrity of the writings, their authenticity, their style, and their credibility. "These four questions," as Dr. Briggs says, "of the higher critics confront every student who ventures a little below the surface in his study of Holy Scripture. How shall we answer them and gain a reasonable degree of accurate knowledge respecting them?" \* Now no one can possibly hold that it is not well that a thoroughly devout and prayerful critical study of the Bible should be made so as to find out all the facts and circumstances connected with the original gift and subsequent transmission of God's revealed, or if you wish, objective preceptive will. † Give us no guess-work upon which to base our hopes and knowledge of salvation. Even the conservative Dr. Green, of Princeton, said: "There is everything to hope and nothing to fear from the progress" of Biblical Criticism. And even though, when the Bible is thus studied some of the results reached cause us to give up many of our interpretations of Scripture, we need not fear that Scripture itself is being given up. We should in studying Biblical Criticism always have before our minds this one question; Is Scripture itself affected by it; or are only my interpretations of Scripture touched? For we must constantly bear in mind that it may be disastrous to the progress of truth to neglect to make a distinction between what really is Scripture truth, and what is simply our interpretation of it.

Gladly granting all that has been said, yet Modern Biblical Criticism—more particularly understood in our day by the term: "The Higher Criticism,"—enters upon the critical study of the Bible hampered with biassing preconceptions, with as-

<sup>\*&</sup>quot;The Bible, the Church and the Beason," p. 125.

<sup>† &</sup>quot;Faith is good, but a faith that is neither enlightened nor determined by facts in the shape of evidence, but simply by the blind assent with which the mind sets itself upon its object, may be as much a basis of superstition as of religion." "Movements of Religious Thought," by John Tulloch, D.D., p. 68.

sumptions, that in many cases materially shade and direct the study in formulated grooves, and thus the critic can have a Bible that suits his own preconceptions as to what ought to constitute the Word of God; and must of necessity reject what does not agree with his preconceived theory. Who realizes not throughout when reading Kuenen or Wellhausen, that their study of Israel's history is biassed by their elimination of all supernaturalism from it, and that this elimination must of necessity give a certain trend to all their interpretations and understandings of the Old Testament? And so we find that in the hands of Matthew Arnold the Bible is cut to pieces in one way-see his "God and the Bible,"-and in the hands of Strauss and Renan with their fundamental idea that "miracles are impossible," and in the hands of the "Tübingen School," and of the brilliant author of "Ecce Homo," the Bible is dissected in a variety of ways. Hence there is a marked difference between this "Modern Biblical Criticism," and what is generally denominated "Biblical Criticism."

In our estimate of the "Higher Criticism" as to its value, we cannot be positive, or final, for specialists themselves are far from agreeing as to questions involved. Still it is not altogether inappropriate to pause and inquire what, if anything, has been gained, and what, if anything, has been lost by it in the way of Bible study. To condemn it wholesale may not be done; to accept it unquestioningly is just as much, if not more, out of all keeping for the minister of the Gospel. Let us, then, inquire in regard to our subject in the spirit of the sentence just written.

I believe that Modern Biblical Criticism has brought to the Christian world an indirect gain in this particular, viz.: By it, and because of it, in our day attention is universally called to a direct study of the Bible. That is to say, the destructive attacks upon the Bible by some who claim to be of the "household of faith," their apparently reckless treatment has directed to the Bible the attention of many who were occupied with discussions of things suggested by it,\* who were speculating about

<sup>\*</sup> Briggs calls it " dogmatism and traditionalism."

it, but were not engaged in its direct study. When, e. g. a half century or more ago, the attacks of Paulus and Strauss followed by Renan, upon the Gospel and the Person of Christ, were made, the world had never studied directly the New Testament sources of information as to the life of Christ as thoroughly as after these assaults. The doctrinal, not to say dogmatical statements made by the ecumenical councils during the early centuries of the Church, had been thoroughly enough expounded and discussions had been earnest enough about Christ and His work; but these attacks led a Lange, a Tholuck, and so forth, directly to the New Testament in critical study as to the Person of the Saviour, with the happy result that Christ as a personal Saviour and Redeemer was made more real to the world.

If we can turn men's attentions from a discussion or study of theories about Scripture, and the non-essentials of religion to a direct study of the Bible with its "plain fact of a personal Creator, a God in history, a revelation of divine love, and duty in His Son," we have gained much; \* and not the least gain is the fact that when this has been done "we need not fear the atheism of to-day." There is nothing so refreshing to the thirsty soul, as to go directly to the fountain of truth and drink deep draughts of divine, loving, inspiring truth. If it is served at second-hand, be it brought in ever such beautiful and attractive cups, it loses its sparkle and its full power to assuage the thirst.

Whatever, therefore, turns men's attention to a direct study of the Bible is a great gain to true religion. And it cannot be disguised that modern Biblical Criticism has done this, and herein we again learn the truth of this Scripture: "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee, the residue of wrath shalt thou gird upon thee." †

"An English Bible was found in the harbor of Nagasaki, Japan. Two brothers read it; one of them testified as follows: "I cannot tell my feelings when for the first time I read of the character and work of Jesus Christ. I had never seen or heard or imagined such a person. I was filled with admiration, overwhelmed with emotion and taken captive by the record of His nature and life."

<sup>†</sup> Ps. 76: 10.

As a result of leading to a direct study of the Bible must be noted that it becomes a more real Book to us. It has not always been such to men. They looked upon its history, poetry, song and story as something which had nothing in common with other history, poetry, song and story. True, the Bible is a sui generis Book; a Book that, in its application and teaching has for its object something distinct from any other book on earth; it has its peculiar characteristics, it possesses traits that differentiate it from all earth's literature. It could not well be otherwise, if it is an inspired book in a special sense, and is to be "our supreme and sole authority in matters of faith, and 'contains all truth necessary for salvation.'" The fact that it has so distinct an object, and has characteristics of so unique a nature, has led men to look upon it as if it were not a real book-a book which all should read, ponder and study. This being the case, it was laid aside for only special use, and was not used for the good and elevating influence it can have upon this life, with its true history, its high-toned morality, its pure and lofty language, its rich store of literature, its sublime poetry, and its remarkable delineations of human nature.

This led to three things:

- (a) The Bible was not man's constant companion to help him, to cheer him, to instruct him, to encourage him, to warn him in his every-day life, as well as in his distinctively devotional and church life.
- (b) Much valuable knowledge which the Bible contains aside from teaching in regard to a knowledge of God and salvation, was kept hid from men's view. Thus men were taught what Sir Walter Scott said so emphatically: "There is but one book, the Bible. The other books are mere leaves, fragments." And what our Whittier has written:

"We search the world for truth; we call The good, the pure, the beautiful From graven stone and written scroll, From all old flower-fields of the soul; And weary seekers of the best, We come back laden from the quest, To find that all the sages said, Is in the Book our mothers read."

(c) People dared not approach the Bible with that holy boldness that makes it an arbitrator in all disputes with conscience in the various departments of life, apart from the salvation of the soul. Witness Luther before his conversion; he did not go to it to find peace of soul, it being chained from free and universal use.

Now the science of Biblical Criticism has assisted in making the Bible a more real Book, and Robertson Smith was correct when he said in his introductory lecture in his "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," that here is the great value of Biblical Criticism.'

Frankly admitting all this, it is damagingly true that the "Higher Criticism" of our day goes too far in this direction. It looks upon the Bible too much as it does upon a book of merely human origin, eliminating all supernaturalism from and reading into the Bible naturalistic evolution, and hence has a tendency to destroy the becoming reverence and holiness with which we should approach it, no matter how real it becomes or may be to us. The true course lies between the two extremes. And if the Biblical Criticism of to-day could but be brought to this, the danger with which it menaces the Church and the Bible would be averted; and in the hope that it will do so, let us not ignore it or uncharitably condemn it in toto. For, as Prof. Green rightly says: "Every encouragement should be given to the freest possible discussion. The attempt to stifle discussion in the present posture of affairs, would be in every way damaging to the truth."

Another thing that Biblical criticism results in is the discovery of new and advanced Bible truths. Daniel Webster but expresses what must be true, when he said: "There is more valuable truth yet to be gleaned from the sacred writings that has thus far escaped the attention of commentators, than from

all other sources of human knowledge combined." Happy that science that has for it object this desirable end! The curse to itself of Modern Biblical Criticism is that, however much in the all-wise and gracious over-ruling Providence of God, indirectly and unintenticnally this end is to some extent at least, being accomplished, it points its criticisms in such a way that it discredits faith in the inspiration, the inerrancy, and hence the authority of the Bible, making it not the but only a source of authority.

One particular of Modern Biblical Criticism calls for notice. By it the two extreme phases of Biblical interpretation-the allegorical and the dogmatic-have been largely done away with; resting the defense of revelation upon a ground that commends itself to sound reason and common sense and upon ascertained facts. The arbitrary fancies and the mystical principles of the Allegorists cannot satisfy this age of critical knowledge of history and language. "The truth of Christ and His spiritual Gospel which only could give the key to the Old Testament, was indeed a profound one. But, instead of studying it in the clear method of history, the Bible was made a sacred anagram; the most natural facts of Jewish worship or Chronicle became arbitrary figures of the new dispensation. Type and allegory were the master-key that unlocked all the dark chambers from the early chapters of the Genesis to the poetry of David or the grand utterances of Isaiah. ever we turn to the Fathers, to the Epistles of Clement, or the sober Irenæus, to Tertullian, who finds the type of Baptism in the Spirit brooding on the waters and in the passage through the sea; or to Augustine, who explains the six creative days as symbols of divine history, we have the numberless cases of this style of exposition. We prize the early Christian writers for their intellectual and spiritual power in the great conflict of faith with a Pagan wisdom; nay, we can often admire, with Coleridge the rich, devout fancy glowing through the homilies of Augustine; but as Biblical scholars, all were simply of a time when true criticism was hardly known."\*

<sup>\*</sup> Dr. Washburn in Princeton Review, July, 1879.

Nor will the dogmatic principle of the Latin Church satisfy men of to-day; a principle that found in the Bible, by proof texts, wrested from their real meaning often, support for any metaphysical or religious dogma which may be held. Luther called such a procedure "a rover and a chamois-hunter." It was wise in Luther to reject the analogia fidei, and claim the analogia Scriptura as that which should be adopted. All arbitrary rules, or preconceived faith, or preconcerted notions should be laid aside in the study of the Bible; that should be studied in its own meaning.\* Hail that Biblical Criticism that will cause men to do this!

But now consider what harm, if any, Modern Biblical Criticism has so far done.

For one thing, it has caused men to look upon the study of the Bible as a mere critical process. When men do this they lose the spirituality of heart and the inspiration to personal piety that come from reading it in loving trust, and with a devotional heart. There is a great difference between reading the Bible with an eye merely to finding in it literary beauty, and history, and reading it in a devotional state of mind for growth in spirituality of heart and personal piety, finding in it the voice of God to the soul, and the reflection of the mind of a loving Father who has in it recorded His message to the soul, giving oneself up while reading it to sweet passages of love, with the God of love. We must never forget-and Modern Biblical Criticism tends to cause us to do so, hence its danger and injury-that the purpose for which the Bible was written, was not its literary and historical value; on the contrary, it was given to us for our growth in Christian spirit and character, and as a revelation of God's will to and concerning man, a message of salvation full and complete in Jesus Christ. Some one has well written: "This word may speak to the mind and heart of a Christian reader, although he knows nothing of the

<sup>\*</sup> A pious monk has said: "Whoever seeketh an interpretation in this Book shall get an answer from God; whoever bringeth an interpretation to this Book shall get an answer from the devil."

methods of exact learning, and if the keenest criticism do not approach it with special reverance for a Book which has fed the spiritual life of men as no other book has done, it will be barren indeed even for the scholar." Because the tendency of Modern Biblical Criticism is in this direction, is it harmful. In the words of another we may say: "This critical spirit is no mood in which to derive practical benefit from the Bible. As a drill for the intellectual faculties, as a stimulus for the investigation of ancient literature, manners, and civilization generally, it may be useful. But it stands in the way of receiving spiritual help. Moreover it interferes with what may be called the structural appreciation of the sacred writings. As we find them. each, with all its diversities of parts, rises before us in a kind ' of architectural unity. But this critical spirit dissolves the fabric." Then this same writer uses this emphatic illustration: "Suppose one was to go into St. Peter's, and instead of studying it as it is, taking in its grandeur, and being lifted up by its esthetic appeals, should set himself about resolving it into its . historic elements, and re-arranging them in the order of their construction, assigning the different parts to their respective architects-this to Bramonti, that to Michael Angelo, that to Vignola, that to Carlo Maderno, and that to Bernini,-would not this analytical spirit make it impossible for him to appreciate the structure as it stands and lead him to descend from the plane of art, to historical pedantry and finesse? So if we are looking always at seams, transpositions and unhistorical naratives in the Scriptures, we cannot take in the separate parts in their proper structural relations, and the whole fabric falls into a mass of disjecta membra."

Anything, therefore, that causes men to look upon the Bible in any other way than a devout spiritual frame of mind is fanciful. Has not modern Biblical criticism tended that way, to say the least? Is it not doing so now? Having raised its many doubts—many uncalled for and unfounded doubts we may add—it has led men to take up their Bibles with an eye too exclusively critical and to study them with a mind bristling with interrogation points.

Hence another charge that we bring against the "Higher Criticism" is, that it has a tendency to cause men to lose their confidence in the Bible. This may not be seen or felt so much among specialists in Bible study, or among ministers, who have time and inclination and whose work it is to study the Bible critically, as among the people in general, who have neither time, nor inclination, nor facility to follow out the discussions, and only know that doubts exist in the minds of men who make Biblical study a specialty. Learning that these are unsettled on many points, the natural consequence is that doubts and distrust are awakened in their minds and they lose their faith in the Bible.\*

Nothing more lamentable can befall a human soul than to lose trust in God's Word. That sets it adrift upon the uncertain ocean of life without a compass, without a guide, without light. Anything that beclouds the sky of faith in the Bible, and relegates it to a dismal murkiness, is a calamity to the world. This " Modern Biblical Criticism" is liable to do, and has done. "If the critics could penetrate this cloudy region with the clear light of definite and fixed principle recognized and admitted by all, and could restratify the history so as to leave an unmistakable historical record, and give us at least a Bible in the new form that would be unquestionable in the order of events, the distrust might soon be over. But they have no common principles of readjustment. Each critic has his own principles and his own method of applying them. No one but the illuminated seers themselves can reproduce the ancient history, and no one of them does it five years in succession in the same way." "Higher Criticism," therefore, has no settled ground upon which to ask a following. "Whither?"-this is the wailing cry

<sup>\*</sup>A case in point, extreme perhaps, but significant, was the experience of a chaplain in a penitentiary with a convict. In religious conversation with one of the prisoners, the latter said he had no faith in the Bible. When the Chaplain urged him to trust in its offers of salvation, he, writes the Chaplain, "fell back on the man in New York, who says the Bible is not free fromerror."

of the confused, bemuddled, drifting soul, that tries to follow its lead.

Then further, Israel E. Dwinell has conclusively shown that "The Higher Criticism" upsets Biblical theology; in fact it makes a Biblical theology next to impossible for "the higher critics detect more than one redactor in the same book-redactor beyond redactor, in separate and independent lines; and each of the blind series is to be Biblically theologized, and have his contribution separately noted and put in a book!" What a medley! Dwinell says: "We have under these circumstances, instead of one Biblical theology of each book, endless Biblical theologettes, each based on an excerpt of the book, having no fixed and determinate boundaries belonging to an uncertain age and author, and separated from the rest by the infallibility of the critic. So the promising, robust, manly modern science of Biblical theology goes off in invisible spray and nothingness. The materials with which it has to do, under the touch of the Higher Criticism, are tremulous and fugitive, and no science can be built up on them." \*

Is it not Biblical theology rather than systematic and dogmatic theology, which latter, are but too often founded upon preconceived theories and systems of metaphysics, that gives us the real theology that ought to be accepted?

And thus also, the Higher Criticism destroys the inspiration of the Scriptures. For according to it the Bible is a patchwork of history, of poetry, of morals, the whole made up, by the redactors and editors and copyists, "into a pretended framework of history in which to set their characters and instructions." Of course if inspiration is to be claimed for such work at all, it is of a very weak and meaningless sort, that amounts to nothing—that may be rhetorically beautiful, but is logically untenable.

<sup>\*</sup>See "Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism," by various writers, No. 9. Funk & Wagnalls: 1888.

<sup>†</sup> This is an attempt to hold up the Scriptures in the air while the support on which they rest is taken away,—to lift them by rhetoric and pull them

As far as receiving the Higher Criticism is concerned, it cannot well be done, for it is all so unsettled, that one knows hardly what to receive; and that which to-day one may take as a settled possession, to-morrow may be taken from him to be replaced by that which in turn may as summarily be set aside.

What we want more than any one other thing in this day of drifting, and unrest, and unsettledness, is a hearty, grateful, recognition and acceptance of and an implicit trust in the Bible, as the foundation of our morality, and the final arbitrator in the social, political and religious confusion of the day, and an exemplification in the hearts and lives of the people of the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as revealed in the Blessed Book. Thank God thus far,—and will it not be so always?—the fiery shafts of destructive criticism hurled against it have fallen broken, spoiled, ineffective to the ground; the heaviest blows have proven useless in beating it out of the world. The blows react in destructive power upon him who attacks it.

"Last eve I paused beside a blacksmith's door, And heard the anvil ring the vesper chime; Then looking in, I saw upon the floor Old hammers worn with beating years of time.

'How many anvils have you had?' said I,
'To wear and batter all these hammers so?'
'Just one' he answered, then with twinkling eye,
'The anvil wears the hammer out, you know?'

And so, I thought, the anvil of God's Word,
For ages skeptic blows have beat upon;
Yet though the noise of falling blows were heard,
The anvil is unworn—the hammers gone."

down by logic. It is evident that nothing sharply and divinely authoritative can be left in them. They drop down in kind of writing to the level of the productions of saints whose productions do not happen to be put in the canon. So not only is a large part of the history, (the historical characters and the central facts of the life of Israel) swept away, but also the very power by which a revelation in language and a direct authoritative message from God to mankind can be produced. All are gone. We are left bankrupt of a veritable Bible and the power by which such a Bible could be handed over to mankind."—Dwinkli.

Denver, Colo.

## IV.

# THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OBJECTIVE AND SACRAMENTAL IN CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. J. W. LOVE, A. M.

THE prevailing tendency of many Protestant Christians seems to be to deny or ignore the significance of the objective and sacramental in Christianity, or at least to regard the subjective as of most importance. There are not a few people, devotedly pious in feeling and purpose, who, without intending it, would yet be their own saviours, or who, at least, base their hope of salvation rather upon what they are, and do, than upon what Christ is, and does for them.

The best of God's people, -as well as those not His people, -are prone to become one-sided in their views, and to emphasize too strongly that phase of truth which takes firmest hold of their mental being. Much will also depend upon the bias of early education, of constitutional peculiarity, and of environment as to what will be held for truth and the most important phases of truth. It is sometimes charged that the objective and sacramental run into formalism: that Romanists, for example, make all account of their Church relations; that they vainly imagine if they are baptized and confirmed members of the Church, go to confession, receive absolution and the sacraments of the Church, they are certain of salvation, especially if they or their friends can pay liberally to pray them out of purgatory, after departing this life. In other words, it is often represented that Roman Catholics expect mother Rome to save them on condition of a simple outward conformity to Church requirements, and ordinances, irrespective of what their lives may be as to morality, and their hearts as to spirituality. There is no doubt much of truth in this charge. When the objective and sacramental in religion are made to be the mere outward, forms observance of rites and ceremonies, there may be an indifference to correctness of moral life, and a spiritual deadness, worse than no religion at all. But it is a misnomer to call this the true objective and sacramental: it is rather the subjective and unsacramental, whatever its preten-

sions may be.

Even the outward formalist, who depends on the objective and the sacramental for his salvation may be wholy subjective in doing so. He is so, if he expects to merit the favor of heaven by the doing of penance, the saving of prayers, or any formal observance of Church rites and ceremonies. Among educated and cultured classes of Romanists, as well as among the ignorant masses, there are doubtless many who expect to be saved by meritorious works-works that consist mainly in outward forms and ordinances, enjoined by bishops and priests, -blindly taking for granted, without investigation, that the demands of the priesthood are the same as the conditions of salvation, enjoined by the Scriptures. If bishops and priests were infallible; if they were always themselves unbiassed interpreters of the Scriptures; and above all, if they were all good and pure men, whose only desire is to lead their followers in the paths of Bible truth, their teaching might have the authority and sanction of Heaven. But there is no assurance that any human teachers, since the Apostles' day have been infallible; we also know that there are fearfully prejudiced men in the ministry, as well as out of it; and that even very bad men have frequently been clothed with holy orders, seeking them for sinister and selfish ends. It is not safe therefore to place ourselves blindly under the leadership of any set of men. or the teachings of any church, without exercising the Godgiven prerogative of reason to ascertain whether we are being led aright. It becomes us to "prove all things and hold fast to that which is good." On the other hand private judgment

may be carried to an extreme. We may discard the infallibility of the Pope and his subordinates, and yet claim it for ourselves. There are not a few self-made popes who would teach infallibly, ex-cathedra, and otherwise. Scores of them with glib tongues, and sophistical arguments have become founders of sects, and have a large following. Usually these wise (?) discoverers of new truth make some one special feature of their teaching the all important portion of divine revelation; as, for example, feet washing; going under the water backward or forward; observing the Lord's Suppper sitting, or standing; discarding all jewelry in dress; wearing coats without buttons and of a particular cut, etc., etc., ad nauseam. That is to say, there are others besides Roman Catholics, who seem to base their hope of heaven on particular outward observances-their own good works. It is surprising, too, what superior piety most of these leaders of the sects develop in themselves and in their following! They are saints par excellence-if indeed, they admit any who differ with them to be saints at all-saints not because they believe in Christ, and live the precepts of His gospel in the sense of loving God with all their hearts and their neighbor as themselves, but because they wash each other's feet, observe some peculiar mode of baptism, or the Lord's Supper-saints because of their peculiar dress, or some other special mark of distinction! It is not much wonder that the average sinner grows weary with these unreasonable pretensions. It is enough to make us all, not only weary, but also heart-sick, that there should be so little exercise of common sense, to say nothing of true piety, on the part of so many professing to be devoted followers of the meek and lowly Nazarene.

Again, there is a large class of people who bank every thing on feeling, utterly ignoring the objective and the sacramental in religion. If only they feel happy as the result of some supposed special revelation, or supernatural manifestation, they are certain of heaven. They lay all stress upon feeling, forgetting that feeling comes and goes, and that it is the most unre-

liable part of human nature, whether in the natural and sinfallen, or regenerate state. The Pharisee felt very happy in the conceit that he was so much holier than others, and the poor publican felt very miserable that he was so great a sinner, but the latter alone went down from the temple justified—not because of what he felt, but because he looked away from himself as the source of salvation to one higher and mightier than he, able to save, and in whose mercy he believed. Feeling may be all right as a result of yielding submissively to Christ, and taking Him at His word, but it should never be made the principle of salvation. We should never mistake the result for the cause.

Emotional people may be very pious; may truly love the Lord and be wholy consecrated to His service; but they should not make a merit of a constitutional peculiarity. It is their nature to feel deeply when they give earnest attention to the things pertaining to their soul's welfare. They are the shouters in religion, or politics as the case may be. They awaken enthusiasm even in the phlegmatic temperament and are a necessary element in Church and State. But they are in great danger of depending upon feeling for their acceptance with God, or rather of measuring their acceptance by their feelings. They too often fail to appreciate the importance of the objective and sacramental in Christianity. Governed mainly by feeling, they are not likely to develop a strong Christian character.

Again, the Objective and the Sacramental in Christianity will be ignored when the subjective takes the form of mere morality and humanitarianism, as is the case among Unitarians.

Not believing in the Deity of Jesus, and denying His vicarious atonement, they assume to be their own saviours, and teach that we are saved by character. Having no Christ in the gospel sense, they have no faith in the Objective and Sacramental, hence they have no church, or sacraments. In their view Jesus of Nazareth was only a man, divine in the sense that men and angels are divine—this and nothing more. We should imitate His upright life; model after His inimitable character.

This is all sufficient to save. There is no hell, or future punishment, and no deliverer is needed. All this we do not hesitate to characterize as "damnable heresy"—the very opposite of the teachings of Jesus Himself and His apostles. However moral, and worthy our Unitarian friends may be as citizens; they are certainly doing great harm to the cause of religion by their heretical teaching. Unbelievers, and those who want to live for the world, as an end in itself, can go into the Unitarian Society with all their unbelief and sins, and put conscience to sleep, in the belief that they are doing something pious. In other words, Unitarian teaching in its opposition to Orthodox scriptural interpretation, regarding the Objective and Sacramental, is leading many souls to perdition, who flatter themselves that they are on the way to a happy future life. It is deceiving many into believing that they can be righteous in themselves rather than in Christ, as the Scriptures teach. It does not require even a moral, godly life to have any hope of being saved, for most Unitarians would have us believe that all alike are saved, whether moral and God-fearing or not,

Strange that it should be so, yet there is no end to the heresies and absurdities taught and believed by many in the first circles of educated, cultured society, as well as among the ignorant and degraded. It is well known that some of our prominent society people are Spiritualists and Christian Scientists, who deny the existence of a personal God! In fact there is not an "ite" or "ism" of any kind, from agnosticism (which does not claim to know anything) up or down, that does not have educated, cultured followers.

The devil's greatest success seems to be in persuading men to deny or ignore the objective and sacramental in religion, and to adopt any theory or system that magnifies the subjective and unsacramental.

Now while there may be danger to orthodox Christianity in estimating too highly the objective and sacramental, or rather, I should say, in underestimating the subjective and depending altogether on the objective, as is admitted Romanists and

others may do, yet it is plain that the fatal error of the age is in denying or ignoring the importance of what Christ is, has done and is doing for the salvation of the world, and in neglecting the Church and her divinely ordained sacraments. There are certainly many very spiritual people in all our orthodox churches, whose desire it is to honor Christ, and who are consecrated to His service, but do yet unintentionally detract from His honor by too much faith in themselves; that is, by trusting in what they think they are and do, rather than in Christ as the principle and ground of their salvation.

If language means anything, the Scriptures plainly teach that Jesus Christ is an all-sufficient Saviour; that we cannot be in any measure or degree our own saviours; that He" is made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30); that in Him" we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace" (Eph. 1:7); that we "are complete in Him" (Col. 2: 10) and so on.

Of course it is not denied by any orthodox believers that Christ is our "all in all," or that the whole of our salvation is dependent upon His merit and mediation, and yet the fact remains that many do hope by their prayers and alms; by their consecration and good works in some way to merit the favor of heaven, so as to bring Christ under obligation to save them.

All agree that no one can be a Christian at all who is not obedient to the Gospel, given to prayer, and who does not have a benevolent heart. True faith in Christ necessitates devotion and consecration to His service, but their value is in the evidence of faith, and love to Christ, which they afford, and not in meriting any part of our salvation.

It is the objective Christ, in His person, life, and work, on whom alone we can rightly base any hope of being saved. Saving Christianity is not doctrine or duty—not what we believe or what we do. Important as it is to believe and do right, saving Christianity is infinitely more than either; it

is the possession of the Christ-life, and a communion of love in Christ, between God and man.

Dr. Gerhart has well said of this communion of love in Christ (Institutes of the Christian Beligion, Vol. 1, Chap. I. Section 18) that it "is reciprocal;" that "in Christ God is active toward man in goodness and grace;" that "in Christ man is active toward God by faith and the obedience of love." We may put it in another way, thus: In Christ God saves; in Christ man accepts of salvation and responds by faith and obedience of love. This thought could be amplified ad libitum. It is not necessary, however, to emphasize it further. Suffice it to say the only salvation revealed in the gospel is that of which Christ is the perennial source. The principle of this salvation is His very life begotten in us by the Holy Spirit, and which manifests itself in the communion of love between God and man. But while saving Christianity in its name and nature is God in Christ giving life, and man in Christ accompting life, yet God does not work in a magical way to convey this life and bring us into saving union with Christ. He has instituted the Christian Church to be the medium and bearer of His life, as also its means of nourishment and growth-I speak now of "the Holy Catholic Church," "the body of Christ," of which "He is the head," and of which all true believers must be "members." This Holy Catholic Church is an objective reality-a living, organic entity-a continuation in the world of the person, life and work of the divine-human Christ since His ascension to the right hand of the Father.

Now when, in the Apostles' Creed, the Church of Christ is qualified by the word Catholic, and is made an object of faith, we must not get a wrong conception of the term "Catholic." It is sometimes used synonymously with the term "Universal." But "universal" may mean all or whole. This thought is fully elaborated by Rev. Dr. John W. Nevin (see MERCERSBURG REVIEW 1852, articles on the Church Question,) In "all" we have a mere abstraction, as when we say all men, meaning thereby the mere collection of individuals. When, however, we

speak of the whole human family, we have something concrete in mind-an organic unity, where individuals as such have no separate existence, though they are a necessary part of the whole. I say, then, the word universal cannot be substituted for catholic unless the conception is that of a concrete wholea oneness without reference to individual parts. The Catholic Church is the universality of a living organism in which Christ lives and reigns, and through which He is saving a lost world. Of course this Holy Catholic Church is made up of all God's true children of all ages and Christian denominations. But in its wholeness it includes more than the individuals who are the subjects of redeeming grace. As a living organism, its life is the life of the God-man; its soul is the Spirit of God; its laws the will of God, as in part revealed in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Nor is the Holy Catholic Church confined to earth; it also includes the heavenly host, all the redeemed of the Lord translated from the church militant to the church triumphant, with their glorified Head who reigns King of Kings and Lord of Lords in both worlds. "The Church in heaven and on earth but one communion make."

Still further, as a part of this "Holy Catholic Church" we must include the ordinances, and especially the sacraments of divine ordination.

In a word, the church of the Scriptures and of the Apostles' creed includes the persons of the Triune God, the family of God in heaven and on earth; the laws governing in the spiritual realm with all their sacramental functions and powers. As such the Church is an object of faith, a mystery of grace, an objective reality—a saving institution in the sense that there is Divine power, grace and love resident in it for all who are a living part of it.

If this be a correct Scriptural view of the Church it will be at once admitted by all holding such churchly view that the Church as an objective reality—a divine constitution and organism cannot be set aside or ignored by those who would be saved. It is the residence of the Divine Spirit, in which He is active in enlightening the sin-darkened world, by the teaching and preaching of the Gospel; active in regeneration and sanctification in bringing home to the heart and conscience the truth taught and preached. The Holy Spirit, in the Church, (not outside of it), begets a new and divine life in the soul of the believer, and brings such soul into living union with Christ, through union with His body the Church. "Of Zion it shall be said, this and that man was born in her." (Ps. 87:5.)

It would seem, therefore, impossible for a man to be born from above, who despises church membership or regards it as only a form. If there is no objective sacramental reality in the Church—if it is not a substantial, organic entity for the saving of sinners, then it is nothing, and, of course, we may disregard it. But if the Church is the continuation of the person, life and work of Christ, then men must be brought into right relation to it, as a very part of it, in order to be saved. The old Latin fathers were right therefore when they said: "Qui ecclesiam non habet matrem, Deum non habet Patrem,"—and "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus."—"The Church" is not only "the Lamb's bride," but the "Mother of us all." (Gal. 4: 26.)

Of course we must not forget, as Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff has truly said: "Church membership is not the *principle* of salvation—which is Christ alone—but the necessary condition of it, because it is the divinely appointed means of bringing the man into contact with Christ and all His benefits."

Those who look upon the Church as a mere society; an association of individuals for convenience, or mutual fraternal benefit, will naturally and logically undervalue the importance of the objective and sacramental in religion. In fact not a few of the unchurchly sects hold up their hands in holy horror when the Church and the observance of her divinely appointed ordinances are made any part of an essential condition to being saved.—They at once scent Romanism, and will not even listen to reason or Scripture, as teaching the true meaning of what

the Church is.—Naturally it depends very largely upon our standpoint as to how we see things. Those who view the Church from its subjective side will see only the subjective side, and vice versa. But the Scriptural and right standpoint is the subjective and objective combined, and taking this we shall see the truth—not in a one-sided way, but as it is in fact—and the Church itself will be "the pillar and ground of the truth."

It may be safely asserted that it is impossible to make too much account of the objective and sacramental in Christianity, provided we also make proper account of the subjective. It is only half truths, or truths held in a one-sided way that are

dangerous.

The sacramental in Christianity is always what God does for us, and not what we do. Thus true Scriptural baptism is God's act, not man's. It is God binding Himself as by an oath to do for man what he can not do for himself, and, in the sacramental act, actually doing for him that of which the sacrament is the sign and the seal. There must necessarily be outward form in administering the sacrament, but there is just as necessarily inward reality, when the form is rightly observed, and the reality rightly apprehended. If the form were unmeaning Jesus never would have instituted it. It is a reflection on His wisdom to say that he would commission His apostles to teach, and baptize all nations, if there is nothing but form in baptism. If there is no meaning in submitting to baptism, Peter, on the day of Pentecost, when asked what those should do who were pricked in their hearts, could not have replied by divine inspiration: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2: 88.) The universal practice of the Apostles, and of the early Church in baptizing converts, certainly had other meanings than that of a mere confession of Christ's name before the world, or they would not have taught baptism by water as well as by the Spirit. Confession could as easily have been made in some other form, if confession alone was all there is in it. And

does not Jesus Himself say: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) What right therefore has any one to ignore baptism as a mere form, without meaning? Surely no one can do so, who understands its spiritual significance as God's act, and not man's. When we are baptized, whether as children or as adults, in the name of the Triune God and by His authority, on the faith of parents, or on our own faith, as responsible agents of the acceptance of its benefits, God receives us into covenant relation with Himself, actually adopts us into His family, and makes us heirs of eternal life. He grants what is symbolized, and sealed by His sacrament; namely the remission of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost, as declared by Peter in the sermon delivered on the day of Pentecost.

"Ah!" says some one who has no faith in the Church or her sacraments, aside from what his subjectivity makes them, "I see you teach baptismal regeneration; you are a Romanist, or at least a High Church Episcopalian." The allegation is gratuitous, and he who makes it does not understand the plain teaching of the Scripture, but, seeing things through his subjective spectacles, is blind to the truth there is in the objective and sacramental. What reason and the Scriptures teach is, not that any one who is baptized, and thus outwardly brought into the Church, is by this means necessarily regenerated. Not at all. The outward administration of the sacrament of baptism may be, and no doubt often is, "a savor of death unto death "-a means of our greater condemnation. There are doubtless thousands upon thousands of baptized and communicant members of the Church, who have never been regenerated. They are still "without God and without hope in the world." But, when baptism has been properly administered, and properly received, when it is God's act, and the conditions on which He promises to forgive sin and give the Holy Spirit, are at hand in us, He, by His Holy Spirit, does what is symbolized and sealed by the sacramental transaction.

If we see a sign over a door, representing a boot or a shoe store, it does not mean that there are boots and shoes to be had somewhere; it means that they are to be had right there, or certain conditions—paying the price. If any one receives a deed to a piece of property, duly signed and sealed, it means that the property is now his in actual fact. The signing and sealing of the papers was necessarily a form, but it means just what it purports to mean. The deed, rightly executed, is an objective reality; the agreement it represents has binding force upon all the parties.

The same is true in the sacramental covenant, with this difference; God's covenant is not an agreement between Himself and man, in the sense that we make agreements with each other. We do not dictate any part of the terms of God's covenant. He is the author of it wholly and entirely. We simply comply with its terms and receive its benefits. God makes the covenant, and when He enters into outward and formal covenant with man, through His sacraments, He actually confers the blessings provided and promised in the pardon of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost. Real Scriptural baptism is not the mere application of water to the subject by any mode, in large or small quantity. It is the application of water, in the name of the Triune God, accompanied by the forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

We must not separate what God hath joined. We must not deny or ignore His divine activity in the sacramental transaction. In the Lord's supper, eating bread and drinking wine is not necessarily feeding upon the bread of heaven, or even commemorating the death of Christ. We may thus eat and drink to our condemnation, and hence better not eat and drink at all. But who will say that when we thus eat and drink with penitent, believing heart, with the desire to commemorate Christ's death, and feed upon His broken body and shed blood, we are not given the blessings symbolized and sealed in the Holy Eucharist? Who will argue that when Jesus instituted His supper and said: "do this in remembrance of me," He meant

that it should be a mere form to be observed at the option of professed disciples? Who will teach from the Scriptures that the Holy sacraments can be set aside at the whim or will of man and no loss be sustained?

But is not this done by many even of those who claim to be teachers sent of God, and who will tell you they are interpreting His word according to its true meaning?

Shall we not then protest against denying or ignoring the objective and sacramental? Is not the danger of Protestantism in this direction? In getting away from the heresy that we are saved by the objective and sacramental, independently of complying with the subjective conditions of salvation, we have swung over too far, and have lost sight of the value of the former: we are trying to be our own saviours, instead of seeking salvation in Christ, and in the way of His ordaining.

We may yield to no one in our appreciation of the spiritual and the experimental, but we should utterly despair of ever being saved, if we were to base our hope on any foundation other than the merit and mediation of Christ.

True faith in Him also compels us to look upon the Church as a divine, objective, living reality—as His body—the bearer of His theanthropic life to us as the mother in whose womb we were begotten by the Holy Ghost, and who gave us spiritual birththe kingdom where Christ lives and reigns, executing His will among men on earth as well as in heaven—the kingdom of grace where, through sacramental means and heavenly powers, He-the Redeemer, Saviour, and Lord-lifts fallen humanity to the highest possible plane of a heavenly life, and from which we are to be translated to the realm of the glorified life at the end of this probationary state The faith that identifies Christ and His Church,-in the sense I have tried to show the Scriptures identify them, -will not be a vain faith. It will be a faith bringing forth the best possible fruits of Christian living -a faith that looks away from poor, unworthy, self and utter helplessness to Him whose merit is infinite, and whose obedience to the law, in all respects met its every demand; to Him whose triumph over all spiritual foes, even death and the grave, was the triumph of His people, and who is what He is, and did what He did, and is the everliving Mediator—all this for each and all believing disciples. To Him who liveth and reigneth in His Church, prophet, priest and king; to Him whose name is above every name, and who alone is worthy, be all honor and praise now and forever. AMEN.

het het is de mei de gewenne de gewenne de de gewenne gewenne gewenne de gewe

The company of the co

As 25 is much manager with language 49 miles, so in the particular states of the pa

e Santa (1) transference (1) de parte parte de proceso de como que entre la proceso de la proceso de proceso de la parte de parte

the distribution of the entry to be a common of the first of the entry of the distribution of the common of the co

## THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF SACRIFICES.

BY REV. D. B. LADY, A.M.

"ALL Antiquity," says Ewald, "believed in a God, as every healthy man still does." An instinct of worship filled the human heart from the beginning. This seems to have found expression in the offer of sacrifices to the Deity. Many statements concerning these, as well as numerous incidental allusions to them are found in the earliest records of the human race.

When we look into the first chapters of Genesis we are met with the information that "the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skins and clothed them;" and it has been conjectured by some that these were skins of animals slain for sacrifice. However that may be, we are told, a little further on, that Cain, the first-born son of Adam and Eve, "brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord;" and that Abel, his brother, "also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof." Upon coming out of the Ark, it is recorded that Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar. Afterwards we learn that Abraham journeyed up and down the land of Canaan, and as far as Egypt, and erected altars to the Lord at various places, and that on one occasion, as a trial of his faith, he was called upon to give up his son Isaac as a burnt offering, for whom, however, a ram was afterwards substituted. The reason assigned for the departure of the children of Israel into the wilderness, when

Moses plead with Pharaoh to let them go, was, that they might offer sacrifices to their God.

Among other nations also altars and sacrifices offered thereon are prominent from most remote times. In the Chaldean account of the deluge, set forth on the monuments, as given in Lenormant's "Beginnings of History," we find these words: "I sacrificed a sacrifice. I made the pyre of the holocaust on the peak of the mountain." In the Grecian narratives of the same event, mention is also made of subsequent sacrifices. ample, the people of Samothrace who escaped the destruction are said to have consecrated the entire island by encircling its shores with a girdle of altars dedicated to the gods. In place of the deluge the Egyptian records have a story of the destruction of the first men by the gods on account of their rebellion and their sins, from which the following sentences are taken; "The massacre being accomplished, the anger of Ra is appeased; and he begins to repent of what he has done. He is entirely calmed by a great expiatory sacrifice. Fruits are gathered in every part of Egypt; they are pounded and mixed with human blood, and 7000 jars full are presented before the god." In response the Majesty of Ra said: "It is well this: I shall protect men by reason of this. I raise my hand on this account, to swear that I will no more slay men." After the birth of the priestesses of Amu, the Majesty of Ra said: "'Libations shall be made to him at each of the feasts of the new year under the direction of my priestesses.' Hence it comes that libations are made under the direction of the priestesses of Hat'hor by all men ever since those ancient days."

It is hardly necessary to state the fact that in the Mosaic legislation among the Israelites, great prominence is given to the priesthood, the altar, and sacrifices. Their system of worship was one in which offerings to Jehovah had the principal place. The public sacrifices of animals which the Jewish laws required to be offered each year are summed up in "Nevin's Biblical Antiquities" as follows: "On every day, two lambs; amounting altogether to at least 730. On every Sabbath, two

additional lambs; making altogether 104. On the first day of every month, two bullocks, one ram, seven lambs, and one goat : amounting in the year to at least 24 bullocks, 12 rams, 84 lambs and 12 goats. On each of the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread, the same as in the case of every new moon just stated, and besides an additional lamb on the second day with the sheaf of first-fruits; making altogether 14 bullocks, 7 rams, 50 lambs and 7 goats. On the day of Pentecost, the same also as for each new moon, and besides, with the two wave-loaves, 7 lambs, 1 bullock, 2 rams and a goat, together with 2 other lambs for a sacrifice of peace-offering; making altogether 3 bullocks, 3 rams, 16 lambs and 2 goats. On the Feast of Trumpets, 1 bullock, 1 ram, 7 lambs and a goat. On the great day of Atonement, the same, and besides a ram and a goat when the high-priest performed his awful duty of entering the Most Holy place; making altogether 1 bullock, 2 rams, 7 lambs and 2 goats. On each of the eight days of the Feast of the Tabernacles, a number of different victims, equal altogether to 71 bullocks, 15 rams, 105 lambs and 8 goats." Summing up we have a total of "114 bullocks, 40 rams, 1103 lambs and 32 goats." "The blood of all these victims, however," continues Dr. Nevin, "formed only a small part of the whole quantity that was poured forth in the sacred court year after year, from the sacrifices that were there presented before the The largest stream by far flowed from the various victims that were led to the altar as private offerings." In addition to these bloody sacrifices, there were "Meat Offerings" and "Drink Offerings" of various kinds: "First-Fruits," "First-born," "Tithes," "Vow-gifts," the devotion of the property of an enemy, the half-shekel tax on the occasion of the numbering of the people, and the temple tax in the days of Christ. On occasions of great national importance the number of animals offered in sacrifice was largely increased. When Saul had conquered the Amalekites, he spared the best of the sheep and oxen to be sacrificed unto God. When the temple at Jerusalem was dedicated "an enormous number of sacrifices

was consumed. The king alone offered up twenty-two thousand oxen and one hundred and twenty thousand small cattle solely as a thank-offering, of which all those who took part in the festival might eat if they chose. Many other persons, doubtless, made similar voluntary offerings; and so great was the number of sacrifices that, as the large altar in the inner court did not suffice to receive them, the king was obliged to consecrate for the same purpose the entire space of the forecourt."

It requires but a slight acquaintance with the history and literature of other nations to convince one of the existence among them of systems of worship involving sacrifices quite as numerous and in some respects similar to those in use among the Israelites. In Egypt, in Assyria, among the original inhabitants of Canaan, among other nations with whom the people of God came in contact during the long course of their eventful history and in the flourishing ages of Greece and Rome, sacrifices held a prominent place. Before partaking of wine at the table the pious Greek poured out a portion of what the cup contained as a libation to the gods. It was his "grace before meat." "The Roman family never rose from supper till a portion of the food had been laid on the burning hearth as an offering to the Lares." In the Homeric age the Greeks "offered sacrifices beneath the open vault of heaven, and, like the nations of Canaan, in high places and sacred groves." The funeral rites of Patroclus prove that they sometimes made use of human victims in their worship. Telemachus offers up prayers and libations before setting sail from Lacedemon to Ithica. About to join the army of Cyrus, Xenophon asked the advice of Socrates, who recommended him to consult the Delphian oracle. He however had determined to go and only asked the oracle to what gods he should sacrifice in order to insure success. In an account of the battle of Marathon, we are told that before the action began, the sacrifices, by which the favor of Heaven was sought and its will consulted, were announced to show propitious omens. And because the Plateans

had come to the assistance of the Athenians and contributed to the victory on that day, from henceforth, in the solemn sacrifices at Athens, the public prayers were offered up for a joint blessing upon both alike. In the Vedic times in India a cow was sometimes killed as a sacrifice, and goats are still sacrificed to Kali. Kali is the blood-craving goddess. "The blood of one human victim," it is said, "gives her a gleam of pleasure that endures a thousand years; and the sacrifice of three men together, would prolong her ecstacy for a thousand centuries." In Jerusalem, in the time of our Saviour, Pilate had a daily sacrifice offered for the empire and emperor. At the period of St. Paul's visit to Athens, the Agora was filled with statues of her great men, deified heroes and representatives of Mythology; "and in the centre of all was the Altar of the twelve gods, which was to Athens what the Golden Milestone was to Rome." "Every public place and building was likewise a sanctuary." "And as if the imagination of the Attic mind knew no bounds in this direction, abstractions were deified and publicly honored. Altars were erected to Fame, to Modesty, to Energy, to Persuasion and to Pity." There is frequent mention made in classical authors, of the sacrifice of a Hecatomb-a hundred oxen, in thankfulness for some great victory, or to propitiate some highly offended Deity; and among many primitive tribes and nations, human beings were occasionally sacrificed to the gods.

Whether sacrifices to the gods were in the beginning enjoined upon men by divine command and ordinance, or grew spontaneously out of man's consciousness of his relation to the Deity it is of course impossible, in the absence of any authentic account of their origin, to decide. Nor does it very much matter. No external command which does not have a corresponding law written upon the heart could ever gain any very wide-spread obedience or respect. Human beings are endowed with a sense of the Divine existence and with an aptitude for Divine communion. If God in the first instance demanded sacrifices, man found his heart responding to the demand, and yielded at once, no doubt, a willing obedience thereto. The universality of sacrifices in the very earliest times and their uninterrupted continuance for thousands of years could not otherwise be accounted for. Even if God did not originally command them to be offered, man must have felt that it would be right to give Him such a service. He had in his heart an impulse towards an adequate recognition of God's existence and a feeling that it would be in accordance with the fitness of things to offer Him some special mark of honor. Such impulse and feeling in this case would find expression in the institution and observance of the sacrifice—a mode of approach to the Divine Being in which the sentiment of worship on the part of man was accustomed to embody itself among all nations in remote times.

It may perhaps be taken for granted that the first feeling in the heart of man towards God was a simple desire to honor Him. It is natural for human beings to respect and reverence those who are their superiors. Men felt that the Divine Being surpassed them in power and in every good and admirable quality, that by reason of His kindness the lines had fallen to them in pleasant places, that He had dealt bountifully with them and given them a goodly heritage, and they sought for some method to please and gratify Him. As they were accustomed to honor one another with gifts it dawned upon them no doubt that gifts might be acceptable to God. This conjecture is borne out by the fact that the original word for sacrifice is Mincha (מנתה), which means a gift, a present, tribute, etc. And as that which seemed most valuable to men in primitive times, with which they were accustomed to pay tribute to their superiors, consisted of the various stores upon which human life is supported, they came to offer the same as an act of worship to God,

The highest antique religions also show by unmistakable signs that in their origin sacrifices were regarded as "the food of the gods." In Leviticus 21: 8, 17, 21, the sacrifice is called literally, "food of the Deity" (כְּהַם אַלְהִים). The Greeks used not only such expressions as "the Gods feast on Hecatombs," but particular gods bear special surnames indicating the same

thing, such as, alrowdros, the goat-eater, apropdros, the rameater, Dionysus, dungric, the eater of raw (human) flesh.

At first these gifts of pious worshippers were not consumed by fire. The sacred tree or stone by which the god was supposed to dwell was anointed with the oil or sprinkled with the blood offered to him in sacrifice, whilst libations of milk or wine were poured out beside them. Other food was merely laid upon the ground or upon a rock and left to be devoured by wild animals or otherwise destroyed. The Hebrew offering of the "shew-bread," or "bread of the presence," was of this nature. It was placed upon a table, before the veil which closed the inner sanctuary. After remaining there a week it was removed to be eaten by the priests, while a similar quantity was put in its place. Sacrifices to water-gods were cast into

the sea, in harmony with the same general idea.

Afterwards the Deity came to be conceived of as dwelling on high, and as being of a nature too refined and spiritual to partake of the coarse food upon which men sustained their lives. It was then thought that these offerings could be appropriated more readily by Him to whom they were made if they were first etherealized by fire. It was only when the sacrifices had gone upward in fire that they were regarded as complete. Thus it is said of the burnt-offering which Noah made after the flood: "And the Lord smelled the sweet savour; and the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." Men also longed intensely for some sign from above that the sacrifice which they offered was accepted. "And to the childlike feeling of remote Antiquity it appeared that such a sign was met with in fire with its wondrous nature. This, breaking forth, moving, and growing like an unlooked for divine being, and bearing what was devoured aloft in its cloud. seemed to be the means of conveying the earthly gift to heaven." The special sign that a sacrifice was accepted by the Deity was that fire came down from heaven and consumed it. It is thought by some that by this token of divine approval Cain and Abel became aware of the fact that the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering. Instances are given in the history of the Israelites where fire of this miraculous character made its appearance and kindled the wood under the offering. The first sacred fire of the sanctuary under Moses was such: "And there came firth fire from before the Lord and consumed upon the Altar, the burnt-offering and the fat: and when all the people saw it they shouted, and fell on their faces." An angel of the Lord touched with his staff the offering which Gideon had laid upon a rock and fire came out of the rock and devoured it. The Lord answered David by fire when he sacrificed in the threshing floor of Ornan, the Jebusite. The decision of the contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal was made in the same manner. The people of other nations also believed that instances of this kind had occurred among them.

Fire offerings having been introduced, the stone upon which the meal had formerly been set out became a hearth where it was burnt, and afterwards an altar, which came eventually to stand for the general idea of sacrifice, whether what is given is consumed by fire, eaten by the priests, or otherwise used in the

service of religion.

The primitive sacrifice by fire was probably the whole burntoffering or holocaust, in which the gift was entirely made over to God and burnt upon the Altar. Man freely in this sacrifice deprived himself of any share in the sensuous enjoyment of what was offered to God. But his desire was concentrated all the more on this account upon receiving the Divine favor for which the sacrifice was made. Subsequently a form of sacrifice was introduced in which God was regarded as inviting those who made the offering to share with Him the pleasure and enjoyment derived from consuming the food. From that time forward we have the sacrificial feast, where only part of the food is burnt. Among the Arabians this was the blood, with the Greeks, the fat and thighs and a small part of each joint, with the Israelites the blood, the fat and the kidneys. When the offering was made through the instrumentality of a priest, he also received a portion of that which belonged to the Deity, so

that the sacrifice was regarded as shared between God, His servant or minister, and those who brought the gift. In the time of St. Paul, as we learn from one of his epistles, meat which had been offered to idols, was afterwards sold in the markets; indicating that he who made the offering was looked upon as having the privilege of enjoying his portion in a feast or entertainment or of turning it into money, should he be disposed to

do so, and enjoying it in some other way.

The primitive inhabitants of the earth were engaged in the cultivation of the soil and the raising of cattle. And just as on this account bread and meat constituted the principal materials of their meals, so the corn and slain offering at an early day entered most largely into sacrifices to the Deity. A very close connection is found to exist between the ancient laws concerning eating and drinking and those concerning sacrifices. This is due to the general principle spoken of before, that the sacrifice was looked upon as a meal for the gods. Whatever was held to be the best meal for human beings was regarded as also constituting a proper sacrifice. And inasmuch as the tendency in all such things is to follow ancient custom cereal and animal offerings with salt and such things as were usually eaten with them, continued through all the centuries to constitute the principal materials of the sacrifice. But as the flesh of animals yielded a more luxurious sacrificial feast, animal sacrifices came, in course of time, greatly to overshadow offerings made up of the products of the fields. Some have also thought that the more powerful and warlike an ancient nation became the more it learned to love the bloody sacrifice; and they account in this way for the gradual preponderance of animal offerings over all others. Whether for one or both these reasons, the history of religion plainly indicates that the fruits of agriculture gave way more and more to the use of animals whose blood was sprinkled upon or poured out before the Altar, upon which the whole or a part of its flesh was afterwards consumed. The corn-offering, especially among the Israelites, gradually fell into the background and became a mere accompaniment of the more imposing animal sacrifice.

The first sacrifices offered by men to God, were no doubt of a general character, the main purpose in men's minds, so far as they had become aware of it, being to honor Him and to come into relations of friendliness and communion with Him. Desirous of showing their gratitude for the blessings of the harvest and the increase of their cattle, as well as for other favors, they brought of the first fruits of their ingatherings and of the firstlings of their flocks as offerings to the Lord. Eager to retain His favor, to enjoy a continuance of His benedictions upon their enterprises and His help in their undertakings, they added numerous additional gifts. These offerings were an expression of the feelings called into exercise and voiced in a modern service of prayer and praise.

The earliest ages of human history were full of joy and hope, as is the case with the early years of every properly conditioned individual human life now. A sense of Divine goodness filled the hearts of men. The Deity was regarded as the friend of man. He had given him many evidences of His favor. He was ready to help him in all his well considered aims. Thus the sacrifice was offered in a joyous and grateful spirit, with full confidence in the benevolent disposition of the Deity towards him who offered it, and with a belief in "that reciprocity between heaven and earth, between God and man, which ever constitutes the final ground of all religion." There may have been involved in the sacrifice, also, as men looked upon it, the thought of expiation. But a sense of sinfulness, and the idea that the Deity might be offended with him seems not primarily to have had much place in human consciousness. Hence the thought of covering or wiping out his guilt did not originally enter very largely into the idea of sacrifices. These were therefore at first mainly of the kind which the Romans called honorific.

But as the centuries passed by, as disasters overtook individuals and tribes and nations, and men became more thoughtful, the childhood of the race giving place to the sober reflection characteristic of mature manhood, men began to feel that they were out of harmony with God. It dawned on their minds

that the Divine displeasure rested upon them. They realized that God's good-will had been forfeited. Gloom and wretchedness filled their hearts. They groaned under the burden of their guilt. They felt that God was angry with them, that His countenance was withdrawn from them, that they were debarred from intercourse with Him. And it became a matter of the utmost importance with them to find some way to propitiate the wrath of the Almighty. Sacrifices now came to be offered in order to secure the reconciliation of God to men. Offerings were made that the lost favor of God might be regained, and that men might be restored to relations of friendliness with Him. The expiatory or piacular sacrifice came, at this stage, to be differentiated from the thanksgivings and prayer offering. And for the expiatory offering the animal sacrifice seemed

peculiarly fitting.

In meditating upon their guilt, men came to feel that their lives with all those blessings from above which alone make life valuable, had become forfeited to God on account of sin. Among ancient nations the life was looked upon as having its seat in the blood, "The life (or soul) of the flesh is in the blood." "The blood is the life." The blood was therefore regarded, in view of the forfeiture of their lives by reason of sin, as the only proper offering to set men right with God. It was the highest, best, most sacred thing which they could offer Him. There was something mysterious and awful in it. When once shed, in the case of animal or man, the life went out. It was like water spilled upon the ground; it could not be gathered up again. When this wonderful and valuable thing was wholly surrendered to God in sacrifice, with the earnest entreaty that He would accept of it, the offerer could believe that this had taken place. "This belief in a gracious acceptance on the part of God," says Ewald, "is the very kernel and centre of the whole act of sacrifice." The offering of the blood-the life of the animal was thus the expression, in its best and most intense form, of man's desire for the re-establishment of intercourse and communion with God; and it served as nothing else could, to awaken faith that this intercourse was vouchsafed him. It renewed confidence in the Divine favor. By means of it man was assured of reconciliation to God and the salvation of his soul. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." (Lev. 17: 11). In such sacrifices the carcase of the victim, among the Greeks, was buried or cast into the sea, and among the Israelites in most cases it was burned without the camp, as were also the children offered to Moloch. In other cases it became a holocaust on the altar, as in that instance of the king of Moab who sacrificed his son, the heir to the throne, as a burnt offering upon the wall, to avert the total annihilation of his army at the hands of the kings of Israel, Judah and Edom.

Two ideas were involved in the atoning sacrifice in which a life was offered to the Deity. The first is that of substitution. This is prominent in all early religions, says Prof. W. Robertson Smith. Spartan lads, instead of being wholly immolated, were merely flogged at the altar of Artemis Orthia. The priests of Baal, in their prayer contest with Elijah on Mount Carmel, "cried aloud and cut themselves after their manner, with knives and lances, till the blood gushed out upon them," (1 Kings 18: 28), giving only part of the blood for the whole of it or for the life. The Romans offered puppets, instead of human sacrifices, to Mania, and cast rush dolls into the Tiber at the yearly sacrifice on the Sublician bridge. Usually an animal was substituted for a human being. Among the Egyptians the victim was marked with a seal, bearing the image of a man bound and kneeling, with a sword at his throat. The same thought comes out in a striking event in the history of the ancestor of the Jewish race, the sacrifice of his son Isaac, "And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in the thicket by his horns; and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt

offering in the stead of his son." There was among the heathen nations as well as among the Israelites a ceremony which represented the laying of the sin of which the one who brought the offering felt himself to be guilty upon the animal set apart as an offering. We have a full description of it in the regulations concerning the scapegoat. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness, and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a solitary land." (Lev. 16: 21, 22).

The second idea involved in the animal sacrifice is that of a re-established covenant or relationship of friendship or brotherhood between man and God. In very ancient times, as is the case even now among tribes and nations where primitive customs have been most tenaciously adhered to, men made leagues of friendship with one another by drinking one another's blood or by a transfusion of blood. This transaction was known by the term, "drinking the covenant." It is described at length and illustrated by many examples in Trumbull's "Blood Covenant." Among other methods of entering into a covenant was that of offering a sacrifice, the blood of which, if not actually tasted, was touched by, or sprinkled upon, both parties to the transaction and upon the image or altar of the god who was supposed to preside over the contract and who invested it with a sacredness which it could not otherwise have had. The ceremony was concluded with a sacrificial feast, point of view," says Prof. Smith, "the sacramental rites of mystical sacrifice are a form of blood covenant, and serve the same purpose as the mixing of blood or tasting of each other's blood by which in ancient times two men or two clans created a sacred covenant bond." Such a covenant was made between God and Abraham. "And he said, O Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it? And He said unto him, Take

me a heifer of three years old, and a she goat of three years old, etc. . . . In that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram." Such a covenant was also made between Jehovah and the Israelites at the promulgation of the moral law. "And Moses took half the blood and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the Altar" (which represented Jehovah,) "And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people : and they said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." After this Moses and Aaron and the Elders of Israel went up into the presence of the Lord and did eat and drink. In coming to a sense of the fact that they were guilty in the sight of God, men came to feel also that the bond of friendship originally existing between themselves and the Divine Being was broken. Perhaps they had a dim remembrance or at least a tradition of that happy period, now long since past, when God walked with men in their earthly dwelling places and held delightful and strengthening communion with them. At all events they longed to come into relations of friendship and a common life with Him. And this they regarded as being brought about by the sacrifices which they offered and the ceremonies connected with them. "In the higher forms of sacrifice," says Trumbull, "on the basis of the root idea of the primitive rite of the covenant of blood, an inter-union is symbolized between the returning sinner and his God." Edersheim says of all the various sacrifices of the Jewish ritual; "These were either sacrifices of communion with God, or else intended to restore that communion when it had been disturbed or dimmed through sin and trespass." "We see then," says W. Robertson Smith, "that the ultimate form of the atoning ritual, as it is found in the day of atonement, is a combination of many different points of view-satisfaction to the judge at the sanctuary, the renovation of a covenant of life with God, and the banishment of sin from His presence and land."

In many of the honorific as well as in some of the piacular sacrifices, whilst the blood was poured out before the altar, or sprinkled upon it in particular cases, only part of the carcase was consumed by fire, the other parts coming back to him who made the offering and being eaten in a sacrificial feast. In the Jewish Passover the lamb was roasted and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs by the family or company which offered it. It was as though God invited those who had secured His favor through an acceptable offering, or to whom He had been reconciled by means of an expiatory sacrifice, to share with Him in a common meal. There was communion and intercourse here between men and their God as a result of the sacrifice. He gave them food to eat. He communicated strength to them and nourished and sustained their life. Among other nations this idea was carried still farther. Certain deities were regarded as being of kin to the nation which worshiped them, and also to a certain animal among them. Once or twice a year this animal was offered in sacrifice to the god. Being of kin to the worshippers its death was looked upon as a murder. In the Attic Diipolia the sacrificial axe. thrown away by the priest, was taken and tried for murder and condemned. But the sacred animal also shared the nature of and represented the god, who thus died for his people. In this case the body is not burned or buried or cast away, but both flesh and blood are eaten by the worship pers, so that the life of the god passes into their lives and knits them to him in living communion. "In the Diipolia at Athens, 'the dead was raised again in the same sacrifice,' as the mystic text had it: the skin was sewed up and stuffed and all tasted the sacrificial flesh; so that the life of the victim was renewed in the lives of those who ate of it."

Considering the strict and minute regulations which had been established with regard to the manner of making the offerings among the Israelites it is not surprising that this duty was often performed in a mechanical and perfunctory manner by men who had no sense of their true meaning, or lacked the

feeling which alone constituted them religious acts properly so ca'led. The prophets in later times often reproved the people for such formality, and pointed out the fact that God had no need of such things. "To obey is better than sacrifice," said Samuel to Saul, "and to hearken than the fat of rams." "If I were hungry I would not tell thee." God is represented as saving in the 50th Psalm: "For the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High." "For thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it," says the Psalmist in the 51st Paalm. "Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering. sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." These and similar passages in the later literature of Israel may be regarded as entering into expressions of regret for sins too high-handed and presumptuous to be atoned for by the established sacrifices, and also as foreshadowing the time when, in the higher religion of Christianity, to which all ancient systems of Divine worship are to give place, the blood of animals should be no longer shed for sin, but when the penitent sinner, having found acceptance with God through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, should bring to him the more pleasing offering of a pure and grateful and obedient life. Similar thoughts are found also in heathen authors. Porphyry quotes from an earlier writer, as we learn from Dr. Edwin Hatch in the Ency. Brit. these striking words: "We ought, then, having been united and made like to God, to offer our own conduct as a holy sacrifice to Him, the same being also a hymn and our salvation in passionless excellence The tendency after the exile, during which time it is presumed no sacrifices were offered, was to dissociate personal religion more and more from the sacrifices, and to connect it with the worship of the synagogue, the reading of the Scriptures and private approaches to God in prayer, thus preparing the way for the New Testament.

The sacrifice, in existence as far back as the records of the race extend, whether technically of Divine or human origin, was a real approach on the part of man toward God. In and through these strikingly significant and sometimes solemn and even awful forms of worship, man gave utterance to his profoundest religious feelings, viz.: gratitude for Divine favor, an earnest desire for its continuance, a deep sense of his sinfulness and his need of reconciliation with his judge, his longing for a restoration to friendship with God, lost through transgression, and a communion which should secure to him the highest blessings which he is capable of receiving. And may we not believe also that God responded to these earnest and persevering efforts to attain to spiritual communion with Himself, and bestowed upon the pious and sincere worshipper of every century of man's history the pardon of his sins and eternal life?

The human race makes successive strides in its efforts to realize the possibilities of good which lie within the scope of its nature. "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs." By reason of this fact the achievements of one period may become types of those which are to follow in a succeeding period. What was sought after, but only partly reached in the ancient sacrifices is fully realized in the great expiatory offering of Jesus Christ upon the cross. In Him the human family yields up to God in a sacrifice of thanksgiving the noblest and best it has been able to produce—the very flower and ripe fruit of its history. He, the Son of Man, is offered that Divine blessings may be secured for mankind. He, a substitute for the sinner, becomes an atoning sacrifice to cover and wipe out human sinfulness-" the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." He is our great peace-offering, and in a holy communion-a true sacrificial feast, we sit at His table and partake of the offering as the bread of God. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." In Christ is realized a communion which was, as coming to view in their sacrificial worship and in the supreme longings of their hearts after communion with God and a share in His life, the desire of all nations.

## HYMNOLOGY AND MUSIC IN CHRISTIAN WOR-

BY REV. J. M. SCHICK, D.D.

What is a hymn? What may be called music? What constitutes Christian worship?

I am satisfied that immortality awaits the man, who shall define these terms, and describe their limitations and relations to each other, in such a way as to satisfy both the critics and the facts in the case as the same time.

But with immortality, so apparently within easy reach, I am too fully satisfied with the enormity of such an undertaking, and, too fully aware of the impossibilities in the case, to grasp at it. I shall hesitate before venturing very far into this inviting field, where others have been lost in their explorations, and you will pardon me when I announce that I mean to keep very near to the fence in this paper.

I am reminded that that most excellent of definers, who defined a hymn to be "a song with praise to God," and added, to make the matter plain, "if there be song and you do not praise God, you do not call it a hymn," got into the ridiculous position of writing hymns, whose object was to counteract the heretical hymns of the Donatists. These he did not hesitate to call hymns. But it had to be done praise or no praise, for the people would sing heresy when orthodoxy was out of reach.

And I have known some since Augustine's day, who knew just exactly what a hymn was, and, where it belonged in Christian worship, sing hymns without ascriptions of praise to God directly, and enjoy them too.

I am willing to confess at the very beginning that I have tried this defining business, in this connection and invariably found similar difficulties besetting ma. Now, if there were no ugly facts to harass a body, one could easily say what a hymn or true music is. But by the time I have settled the question that such hymns as "There is a Happy Land" are not hymns at all, being only songs about heaven, I catch myself singing, with a heart full of love to Christ, the glory of it, "Jerusalem the golden with milk and honey blest." And then, after I explained to my Sunday-school the impropriety of singing in worship "Work for the night is coming," my monitor reminded me that only last Sunday I had had the congregation sing, "Ye servants of the Lord each in his office wait."-and had selected it myself. And I am about fully convinced that the priest who sings, "Come ye disconsolate," has no good ground to stand upon, when he criticises the preacher who sings, perhaps not so musically, but awfully effectively, "Come ye sinners poor and needy."

With fullest appreciation of this fact, this work is undertaken, and if occasionally the writer seems to have a disposition to define or describe hymns or music, it must be attributed to that most common tendency in the very nature of our humanity that leads men to seek, what others have decided unfindable. Excellent mathematicians, you know, have tried to square the circle; and, not a few really good mechanics have wasted time in the search for perpetual motion; and even Christopher Columbus attempted a westward trip to the East Indies, and found, well, you know, he forgot to continue his

investigations as soon as he saw America.

A most interesting introduction to the discussion of the subject of hymnology and music in relation to Christian worship, would most naturally be a review of the music of the Hebrews in connection with the Psalms of the Old Testament, the hymnology of the Jews. For, whatever be the opinions entertained, respecting the use of hymns and music in Christian worship, on one point there can be no difference of opinion, viz.,

that the first hymns of the Christian Church, both as to words and tunes were the Psalms of the old covenant.

But, however proper and fitting such a procedure would be, we are hindered by the difficulty, so common in careful investigations, that nobody seems to know much about the music of the Hebrews. No instance of musical annotation has been found among the antiquities of the Jews. This, however, does not prevent writers from indulging in a world of guessing on this subject, and one will have but little difficulty to find authority for almost any view he may hold in the premises.

It seems as if the standpoint, from which the investigator starts his search, determines his conclusions. If one believes that "music and poetry ever move hand and hand with equal step," for the two are practically inseparable, and, in the light of this connection, proceeds to consider Jewish music, he is compelled to find that the Jews had music of the richest, grandest character to express the emotions found living in the psalms—so vast in their wealth of feeling, devotion, adoration, penitence, comfort, passion; so rich in imagery, description, example; so really human, and, yet so near the bourns of the divine; and, so deep in spiritual wisdom, that nothing short of absolutely sublime music could be deemed a proper means to carry them outward, upward.

And this view is supported by the evidences of the great attention paid to the culture of music, and the use made of it in the service of the tabernacle and temple. So that, with all the recorded evidences at hand, no one can help accepting the conclusion that the devotional music of the Jews was a very

highly developed art.

But if the investigator start with the instruments, which had to make this grand music, he must at least scratch his head or stretch his imagination, to a very high degree. Yet no honest investigator does either. He never does. So when he sees a harp with from three to twelve strings at most, an organ capable of making from four to seven tones, trumpets and horns capable of producing only such variety of tones, as

the musician could make by the way he blew the blast, high or low, soft or hard; drums and cymbals of single tones only; he in his severe honesty strips the music of its charms, and insists that the Jews had very simple music—though at times, as he is willing to admit, they had lots of it.

However, since definite determination is impossible, we are left in the mists, between Delitzsch, who insists that the music of the Hebrew was never more than a cantillation; and Herder, who believes that the poetry of the Psalms acquired "new power, a more graceful movement and greater harmony of sound" from the music itself; with Professor Jahn between, straddling the chasm, by saving that music was very highly cultivated, and, at the same time, admitting that by some it might be regarded very noisy, and suggesting, that this is after all a matter of taste. It may, therefore, be well for all to lay a milder stress upon the emphasis with which the guesses of others are combated, and together rejoice that whether the music were grand or common, complex or simple, it, together with the Psalms of the old covenant, formed the basis of that form of Christian worship, which, with occasional exception, has been the means of expressing, in rapturous outbursts the religious life of believers in every age, and, by which, in the weary days of the earthly pilgrimage, the heart of the faithful heavenly citizen has ever been able to enjoy foretastes of the delights of that worship in the home country, where, undisturbed by knowledge of sin or consciousness of imperfections, the whole company of the redeemed shall unite in unceasing praise to the Lord of man's salvation.

This, however, should be said: If music was a highly developed art in the days of Israel, it was lost afterward, and at the time of our Saviour's advent, song had a new birth from above. The music and hymn of the synagogue no doubt was the first music of the Church, but very soon there was developed a body of Christian hymns. Traces of these are found in what seem to be quotations in the Epistles and in Revelation. At any rate we early find a body of hymns clustering around the

incarnation as if the Church had caught the keynote from the angels' song. After the hymns and fragments in the New Testament, we find frequent mention made that the apostles sang praises together, and St. Paul enjoins believers to speak to each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, making melody in their hearts to God. From this it must be inferred that there was much singing; and very early many hymns were indited and used by the Church. But of the tunes we lack information, except that St. Augustine says of the music that it was more a speech than a song.

Here it is that regrets crowd upon us, because we find no scores of the tunes, but when the soul is full of praise the grateful heart must find expression in some form. It may be the hymns were sung to the tunes of the secular world, for it is noteworthy that, when the soul is most moved, it is possible to lay hold of and sanctify what otherwise would be almost profane. So in the Reformation days, when we have come to the time when tunes and hymns are preserved for us, we know full well that frequently the Church stole from the devil, as it were, and used with changes in words the profane and even licentious tunes of the world. This would, at any rate, not be the only instance in which the Church converted the profane to sacred uses, and lifted the worldly heavenward.

However that may be, and whatever the character of the music might have been, the number of hymns constantly increased. The unfolding of the conscious Christian life began to express itself, and the joy of heart found means to indite itself for others, and soon a body of hymns was given to the Church for its use. There are differences of opinion as to their merit. But they were used and enjoyed in their day. From these beginnings grew the great body of hymnology of our Christianity, the extent of which it would be a difficult matter to even conceive.

Every age has its own hymns. These satisfy the devotional necessities of the time in which they were born. Most of thembeing peculiar to their own age, die early. And, come to think

of it, what a blessing that is! A few outlive their time. Impressed with the Spirit of the Christ that gave them birth, they live in all ages and are used in all times. These are the old hymns ever new. Of them no one tires. They bring into our lives the inspiration of other days, and they are sung as our fathers sang them. The spirit of worship they express will ever keep them living so long as devotion shall be a form of expressing the Christian life.

But it would be sheerest folly to even try to compass, in this paper, in any detail, this body of hymnology. Who would be able to go round this world in forty minutes? It could not be done, if one were to go spinning from peak to peak as they rise above the mountain chains that traverse the hymn world at a

rate that even Verne never dreamed of.

It will be more to the purpose if we consider that, whilst every age in the life of the Church was productive of more or less hymns, and, perhaps, no age was really without some one being inspired, to lead the singers yet those times were most productive which were times of active soul life. When men's hearts were tried. When the reality of the life in man sent his blood pulsing through his veins and brought him to a conscious realization of both his need and help. These were always times when the hymn-making power was especially active. It was when heresy and heretical disturbances quickened the heart throbs of Ephrem Syrus and St. Augustine that their love of the truth, as they saw it, fired their hearts into songs. was when the whole soul life of Germany was stirred to its very inmost depths that there broke out that volume of devotional hymnology that marks the reformation as distinctly as any other characteristic that might be named. For the spirit of the times is deeply impressed upon the hymns themselves, so fully as to make them a history of the era.

So, too, it will be found that when an individual wrote a hymn—one that lives, I mean,—it generally was "an outburst of religious life," the product of some occasion in which the heart spoke more than the intellect, and this it is which gives hymns such a fascination and the study of them such a charm, and perhaps it explains why in one age the hymn writer could be so truly orthodox, and why in another so absolutely a nonconformist.

In the manner of singing these hymns, there seems also to be a development from an apparently very simple beginning. As already mentioned the music of the first days of the Church's history must have been quite rudimentary, and most likely quite destitute of harmony. The melodies must have been such as were easily learned and kept in memory. For notation of music came much later. All the older music was simple and learned by repetition, and such a course would have precluded much that is now required in good music. Often one person sang and the people joined in the refrain; at other times, all sang. But this seems to have been about all the variety which singing afforded at the beginning of our era. Then Ignatius introduced the Antiphon at Antioch. There is a tradition which attributes this step to a vision, in which Ignatius saw the angels singing hymns to the Holy Trinity after this manner. This was the beginning of the Ambrosian chant, for when Ambrose visited Antioch he was moved to introduce the same plan of singing at Milan. He used, instead of the unisonal mode in vogue before him, the four authentic modes, with such effect that Augustine, speaking of the hymns and canticles he had heard, says: "The voices flowed into my ears, the truth instilled into my heart, I overflowed with devout affection and was happy." He also says that this custom of singing was introduced "lest the people would get weary" very much, I suppose, as we would sing "From Greenland's icy mountains" between the speeches at a missionary meeting. Then Gregory of Rome a couple of centuries later added the plagal modes for chanting purposes and gave us the Gregorian chants.

With the reformation began the use of the choral, which grew into our metrical tunes and other modern manners of singing to the praise of God. From this outline it is easy to see that the singing varied from time to time. For the most part it remained under the conduct or, at least, direction, of the professional singers, and I may here remark, parenthetically, that this matter of song has given the Church a great deal of trouble. Not only now, but almost from the beginning the people would sing. The singing would not always be orthodox for the ecclesistics, nor correct according to the canons or singers. At one council, (Laodicea), it was expressly ordained that none but canons should presume to sing in church. I guess they must have had trouble with the people who dragged the music or who could not keep the tunes to suit the singers, and the church to keep the peace was compelled to side with the canons. This is only mentioned in passing, for the comfort of any brother who finds his choir "one too many" for him.

Another peculiarity of the earlier singing was the trouble the heretics made. They would sing. They were not so very particular, as were the churchmen, about the entire correctness of the music. They were ideal hearts for the musician, being freer than the orthodox. Athanasius called the music light and condemned the hymns as improper. But condemning never corrected a wrong, and heretical singing and processions were very frequent, so much so that, in his day, Chrysostom tried to mend matters. He inaugurated orthodox processional hymn singing, with great pomp and good intentions. And when the two processions, orthodox and heretic would meet singing their hymns of praise to God, bloodshed and riot would frequently succeed to His greater glory. So God used the foolishness of man to praise Him, for whatever else resulted music developed.

Since music as well as poetry gives expression to emotion, it would be natural to expect that they would soon adapt themselves to each other. But one of the great difficulties with the music of worship seems to be the adaptation of tunes to hymns. What versions of music for given hymns have crowded upon the world. Each musician seems to see where the others have failed, and then he has great trouble to make other people see it.

512

Very early explicit directions were given to singers: of course when the modes and tunes used were few the directions were simple enough: that solemn hymns should be sung very slowly and with subdaed voice and hymns of rejoicing with swift measure and loud voice. Then when the various scales had been introduced by Gregory, the development was such that certain keys as the modern C. Major was by Pope John XVI denounced as lascivious and proscribed from use in the Sanctuary. Especially did he forbid the use of the voluptuous harmony of 8ds and 6ths as fit only for profane use. What is the proper music for a given hymn? is a question long confronting the Church. So it was when the old choral music seemed established, but when the multiplication of hymns, in our ordinary English metres, took place, we find tunes multiplying as rapidly, and a little later, more rapidly, until a perfectly bewildering assortment of music books, with tunes for worship confronted every one as soon as a hymn was announced to be sung, and, as no one seemed to have any positive authority to decide, all sorts of tunes were sung to all sorts of hymns, except that a few being especially well adapted to each other seemed to come into use by a sort of common, or rather uncommon, consent as given to each other. But most tunes, like most hymns, filled a place in the book and with that their mission ended, while others expressing true or proper sentiments lived to become standard and these form a body of music from which selections of tunes are really made.

Latterly (since say 1860) a different tendency has been pursued. A sort of differentiation and synthesis. Individuals, and then churches, made collections of hymns and tunes, adapted to each other for use in worship, and so settled for themselves, at leat, the question as to what are proper hymns or tunes to be used together, and this perhaps will be followed by a greater elimination later on. How many failures occurred no one may know. Tastes do differ. One man's choice is another man's special rejection. But even with all this it cannot be but that great good must come from these collections, which, if the proper care has been exercised, must at least give

each hymn some proper tune, and, as the church becomes familiar with them, it cannot be otherwise than that the people will know and use them. And this is after all the real use of hymn and tune in the service, that the people shall find in these the means of expressing the feelings of devotion, with which they would worship.

The purpose of music is not to create the emotion, only to awaken and express it. No martial music can make a coward brave; but by it a brave man is incited to deeds of daring even when the bravery must first be called out by the same music. So, by the service of song, in the sanctuary the believer's heart may be quickened into ascriptions of devotion and praise. But the music would be powerless to have the same result in the unbeliever's ear.

Whatever else may be said about hymns and music in worship there is one thing never to be forgotten, and that is, that the very idea of such use implies that all the people sing. "Let all the people praise Thee." Where the people allow one to sing, or where the singing is resigned to a few, and the congregation becomes a body of listeners, the idea of worship must in reality give place to that of entertainment, and as this is so largely an age of entertainment, it will not be wasted time to emphasize, as strongly as possible, that no part of the service can be devoted to the entertainment or enjoyment of the worshipper. For in proportion as the people make prominent the individual enjoyment, do they turn the worship into a service for themselves rather than for God. It is because so many seek for entertainment that much of the difficulty in this form Then members of the choir of worship has been developed. may grow jealous of each other, and the criticisms of the people begin to count. Then the choir must be paid and strangers invited to hear it, and we must have the finest in town and Sunday evening, especially, must be more entertaining than a sermon can make it, and more attractive than the ordinary service would permit, hence all is changed for a song service, a sort of an entertainment or sacred concert to draw the people to the church. What for? Shall the character of the Church and its service be changed only to entertain the people? If this tendency be not corrected only evil can result, no matter how ex-

cellent the singing may be.

It should be forever settled that when a congregation of Christians assembles for worship all features of entertaining the worshipper are totally out of place, whether they are presented from the pulpit, at one end of the Church, or choir loft at the other.

It has long been a settled point as respects praying, then-

why not for the singing as well?

We are all ready to insist that prayer can be made to God only, and would condemn any one who should attempt the ridiculous idea of praying to affect the sinner, or to comfort the saint, as the object of the prayer. That a prayer may be effective for these ends and in many others is not to be denied. But that is not a prayer which is offered to the saint or sinner in the hour of his need. This is understood. No one thinks of inviting any one to church to enjoy the preacher's prayer, nor of being benefited by it. The very same should be true of the singing.

As soon as the idea of entertainment is given up, the participation of every one in the service will follow as a consequence. All owe a debt of praise and each one will have as really a personal part in the ascription of praise as would be had in almsgiving and prayer; and whatever shall help to make this plain will be useful in developing the devotional spirit of the congregation. No voice should be silent in the service song any more than in confession of faith, for instance, and never would be if it were not for the desire to be in keeping with the artistic development of the rest of the world.

We have our ideas of art. A standard is set up and this standard is generally set to the highest notch of our musical

education or musical instructors' dicta.

But the trouble lies here. The circle of those who can understand or appreciate this music is so very small; and it can be noticed that in every circle there are a few who can see a little farther into the possibilities or impossibilities of the art than the others. These form a still narrower circle of real musicians. No one, who pretends to musical taste, is willing to risk his musical reputation by daring to say that the appreciation of this class of music is beyond his sesthetic ability. Hence the narrower the circle the greater the authority in matters of music. At the end of the eliminations one can easily imagine a virtuoso so refined as to be made nervous by any music except that so classic as to be beyond the comprehension of any body else. Now, as the very highest perfection is aimed at in the music of the sanctuary, this one, unfortunately, is called upon to select the music best adapted to the truer expression of the religious emotions of the worshippers. And these, forsooth, sit in subdued silence, whilst the thoroughly trained singers praise God for them in the use of music, so classic, that most could not appreciate or understand it, and so refined that not one in the congregation could execute it, if one could be found bold enough to try. Excuse me, but I don't believe in any such nonsense. It may do very well for music as music, but as the handmaid of religion to assist the congregation in its devotions, such music can only be absolute failure.

This is not a plea for a lower standard in music, but for a different one. It will not do to call music good simply because we do not understand it well enough to call it bad. It is easy to fall into such an error. A good story illustrating this kind of wisdom, in another sphere, is told by Bro. E. N. Kremer of a Welsh preacher, with a good endowment of native wit,—who captured a congregation, which could be satisfied with only the most erudite preaching, by quoting in his trial sermon Latin, Greek and Hebrew, to the admiration of the people who understood neither the Welsh he used, nor the other languages he did not use, and for which he had substituted the Welsh.

The standard of measurement for music, in worship, cannot be a poor one, and yet, I cannot get away from the idea, that music, which prevents the participation of the people in the worship, is poor music for service in the church.

It is not the province of this paper to discuss music as an art in its relation to devotional inspiration in the sunctuary. It cannot be doubted, that it has a sphere in which its highest development can be useful in the service of the Church as fully as painting, sculpture, architecture. It certainly seems reasonable, that this art, which has the most authentic assurance of immortality, which from the beginning into eternity, in the perfection of the heavenly world has a place in the adoration of saints and angels, and, which has been a means of communication with man from the unseen world, should find some way in which to use its highest beauty, as an instrument of sublimest grandeur, as an ornament to the worship, in some such order as the other arts have found their way, to elevate the mind, to awaken in the soul the spirit of truest devotion and lead, as it were, the worshipper into the holy of holies of Christian service.

No other art has been so prolific in results for pleasure, for war, for sensuality. None has contributed so much to awaken passion and natural delight, and it cannot be, but that, in the fuller and truer development of its use, there is, for music, a sphere equally as effective for awakening spiritual emotions in the service of the Church as the embodiment of real Christianity. But the demonstration of that sphere really belongs to the Christian musicians, who recognize the problem and are even now doing something towards its solution.

Only, that sphere cannot be the ordinary praise of the ordinary worshipper. Here, as elsewhere, the carnal mind is enmity toward God. For the fact is, that for a very large proportion of every congregation, a too highly refined musical art is destructive to devotional participation. And the real truth must be recognized, that the number of such as can enter into the spirit of the so-called, highly developed musical composition is in any given congregation very small.

The character, therefore, of both the music and words of the hymn to be used in worship should be within the capacity of the

people.

Any one can see that a hymn, composed of words, which cannot be comprehended by the mind, would be useless as a means to worship, no matter how true to the laws of language it might be in its composition. And equally useless must the tune be, that cannot be sung by the worshippers.

Of course music, intended to be used in worship, cannot be less than good. The laws governing proper melody, and true harmony, are ever to be observed, and nothing less than the very best can be regarded with any toleration in worship. Only there should be no misunderstanding as to the best. And it seems rational, to use as one of the factors in determining what is best, the purposes for which the music is intended. The mere fact that the music is in correct taste, or that it, in some degree, approaches an ideal, cannot determine its proper character for use in worship. Especially is this true when such approaches to the ideal involve great musical ability, on the part of the worshipper, who attempts to join in the devotional act.

The tendency of very high standards of musical skill in the composition of hymn tunes is to reduce the general participation in congregational singing, in other ways than the one indicated above.

For instance, the spirit which criticises those, who cannot attain success in executing the complex achievements attempted in the composition, is generated, both because every slight departure from the score grates on the sensitive ear of the musician, and by right of the latter's ability, it is allowed him to relieve himself or his injured musical instincts, by pointing out the fact that somebody's tenor was too sharp, or another's bass too flat. And yet it is fair to insist that no one has the right or privilege to sit in judgment, and especially critical judgment, over the devotional acts of another. No man dares to lay his critical hand upon the mouth of any honest worshipper, whose heart finds expression in a song of praise, because forsooth his tones have a nasal twang, or because he is a little sharp or flat, for the other singers, who are always in tune,

even if less devotional. He cannot sing the hymns to suit the choirs and is silent.

Again, the music expresses a sentiment, and the melody carries this sentiment for most people. But a good musician, who fully understands music, sees the possibility of making the expression still more complete in the fuller development of the idea in the arrangement of the parts constituting the harmony. In his hand, harmony is not intended to sustain the original melody, but each part without any violation of the laws of harmony becomes a part in itself, and four melodies are mingled, and the original melody expresses the sentiment in connection with three others at the same time. The musician is happy over the result, and the ordinary untrained singer wonders what in the world is the matter with the old tune he used to love so well. He doesn't sing as loudly as he did before, and after a few unsuccessful efforts to get the run of the tune gives it up, and he too joins the grand army of silent singers.

So this tendency could be demonstrated forward through other phases, but all of them alike show the same result, that it is too largely true, that in proportion as the singing of the choir becomes more artistic, the voices of the people are silenced until in many churches congregational singing is almost a positive

curiosity.

This perhaps may also be an explanation which accounts for the great popularity of the much condemned and yet frequently sung modern, light music. It does not live long. But it does awaken emotion, and, whenever used, is sung by a large proportion of the people assembled. In much of it there is no true expression of devotion. And this is the case both with music and words. But the artistic standard permits of general participation, and all can sing without the least danger of offending the ear of any of the other singers.

Now while I have little sympathy for popular music, and none for the latter-day so-called spiritual songs, designated spiritual songs, because even their own authors would not dare to call them hymns, and, in truth, there is too frequently as little of the spiritual as there is of the hymn in the song. Yet I can see that there is in the simplicity of the arrangement of the music something which, because of its effect in awakening the devotional spirit, and in calling forth a full participation, suggests to those who are anxious for the real devotional hymns the possibility of a sacred music which shall be at once simple in composition and pure in character, and yet, so grand in movement as to lift the soul heavenward as it were, and both awaken and express the emotions of true worship. This, at least, the music, which has displayed so much scientific refinement, has not done in a way to allow more than a meagre few to enter into.

After all is said the truest art in music, in its proper sphere, is that which is free and not bound to any law other than this, that it may become "the medium and breath of the common devotions of the people," and the very fact of its simplicity of arrangement must always be proof positive of its high artistic standard.

Here the question may arise, whether it be better to educate the people up to the requirements of scientific refinemen in church music. So much is said about this by the musicians. But we are confronted with another question. Can it be a legitimate object of the service to educate a congregation in this art? To state the question is to show the difficulty. There is no question but that the education will be effected in time. Congregations have been educated up and down in a great many ways as the history of the Church sufficiently shows. But it will hardly do for that reason to turn the act of worship into an art school to elevate the taste for music.

And yet, for all this, even if the opinion of the writer prevails, and it is accepted that the use of hymns and music in worship legitimately requires that general participation which the paper indicates, the fact confronts us that the singing cannot be poor. Improvement is certainly necessary. Not only is it a need that all should sing in worship, but that singing, in

all its freedom, dare not be out of time, drawled, expressionless. Those who know how to sing must lead the others, and the unlearned must follow that lead. Just how to bring a consummation, so devoutly to be desired, is a problem to be worked out. However this may be brought about, the one thing to be ever emphasized must be that the devotional singing is not for the few expert singers, but for every one whose religious life goes out in praise and thanksgiving to God.

One great hindrance to the general participation in the service of song has been the desire of the singers for change and variety in music. A chorister will keep records of tunes used so as to repeat tunes as rarely as possible. Yet it is notorious that a tune to be well sung must be learned, and this learning is brought about, for the most part, by frequent repetition.

The good congregational singing of the German churches is to be attributed to the fact that but few tunes are used in worship, and the people grow familiar with them, so familiar that all can join in the service of praise, which is as it should be. And it is safe to say that if a church will, for a number of years, use its own hymns and tunes, the result will follow that more and more general will become the participation in this form of worship.

For no minister will use over 200 hymns, and a much smaller number suffices to satisfy the needs of most pastors, and the congregations soon learn to know the tunes and to sing them, unless the leader of the choir defeat the progress by a constant change of tune. Here the advantage of a hymnal is apparent, even if the selections are not always the best for any given individual.

In our own church variety is afforded by the themes clustering around the lessons and seasons of the Christian year. This will eliminate the possibility of any monotonous recurrence of given hymns. For even the repetition of a hymn in any given season, will only add to the charming heart life by its very expression of the embodied sentiment. Thus hymns and tunes appropriate and adapted to each other will be met in the recurring seasons, which themselves are really the unfolding of the religious life of the Christian, and so belp in the outburst of praise. All monotony is avoided, and in time full familiarity with both hymns and tunes, will develop what is so much desired—fuller congregational participation in singing.

And, now, since in this day of the Church's life, when it is hard to conceive a service without the element of praise in hymns to God, let us realize how wholly it is to the service of Him whose delight seems to be in the adoration of saints and angels, and be inspired to bring the Church to a more general

whole-hearted participation in this form of worship.

In hymns the thankful heart has voiced its gratitude; the penitent soul has poured itself out in true contrition; the downcast have strengthened their confidence in God, as they sang His omnipotent love. In hymns the martyr honored the Christ he glorified in suffering; and the pilgrim, journeying through life, has made more real, for himself and others, the heavenly city, while he sang to Christ the glory of it; and the saint, passing out from sin and sorrow, has sweetened the bitterness of suffering by singing of the victory and the resurrection.

Hymns, as the outburst of our religious life, belong to every condition and experience of our Christianity, and he who, as poet or pastor, can, by any means, add to the more general participation in their use, in church and home, will do much for the greater enjoyment of the Christian life itself, as well as for the greater glory of God, whom we serve in worship.

## VII.

## CHRIST'S ESSENTIAL SONSHIP.

BY THE LATE REV. SAMUEL H. GIESY, D.D.

In the Creed Christ is confessed to be God's Only Soh. Placing the emphasis on the word only, where it properly belongs, and there is indicated in some sort a separation of Christ from all mankind, putting Him in a class by Himself. Do the holy Scriptures consistently interpreted and the marvellous facts of His life bear out this sublime and solitary designation—Son of God?

This title, doubtless, expresses the absolute, eternal Being of Christ. The inherent idea of sonship is such an actual community of nature: the properties of the father imparted to and received by the son. It implies more than simple likeness whether in feature or form; identity of nature, participation and share in the deepest substance of his being—oneness of essence and oneness of existence.

Yet the title is not an uncommon one in Scripture, and was used originally with wider latitude. It was made to cover almost any kind of descent or succession. Thus, in the book of Job, the angels are so called several times, especially in the memorable passage indicating their presence at the dawn of creation, "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." But such reference is not possible, when in an early chapter of the book of Genesis "the sons of God" are represented as regarding with lustful eye "the fair daughters of men." Here, undoubtedly, the appellation is applied to earthly potentates, to those who in the world's childhood had risen to authority over others. The best commentators from Theodoret down explain the phrase,

"sons of the Highest," (Psalm 82:6) as designating representative men, clothed, in a sense, with the dignity and authority of God as rulers of His people; and hence, the children of Israel, the favored people of God, were specially called collectively by God, His son (Exodus 4: 22, 28; Hosea 11:1).

And not unfrequently, because of His relation to men in their creation and preservation, God is termed the Father of men. By creative energy and provident care, since the inception of life inheres in Him and its continuance depends on His watchful superintendence, we may in a true and profound sense be called sons of God, but not sui generis; not sharers in His essential, Divine nature. We hold our being from Him. In Him we live and move. He made us and not we ourselves. We are of God, but not God. Mere creaturehood under this, its highest and sublimest and divinest form, stands at an infinite remove from the Almighty Father of angels and men.

Nor must it be overlooked that the appellation, "sons of God," is applied in a profoundly spiritual sense to believers. In regard to such St. John uses this very strong language, "To as many as received Him, gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Again in his first epistle, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." And St. Peter even more boldly expresses this spiritual revelation when he speaks of believers being "partakers of the Divine nature," i. e., of the holiness which is God's native property and His pre-eminent characteristic. It is in this way the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews explains it when he gives us to understand that the one purpose of God's discipline is to make us evermore "partakers of His holiness." And following the plain meaning of holy Scripture, the Church hesitates not to apply this appellation to all incorporated into the family of God by baptism. "They are sons of God, but sons by adoption in virtue of their fellowship with Him who is Son by nature."

524

When now these terms are applied to Christ freely and frequently, "HIS SON" as in the familiar passage, "God sent forth His Son," as St. Paul speaks of Him; "HIS WELL BE-LOVED SON," according to the synoptic Gospels; "HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN Son" that mysterious word which St. John employs, asserting most explicitly His unique relation to the Father, and on two occasions appropriated by Christ Himself without the slightest reserve or moral shock, nor timidly put away, nor hesitatingly accepted: when others named Him to His face "THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD"-is it only in the same constructive and non-natural sense that such strangely significant terms are used? Is it an adequate explanation to regard them simply as titles of supreme affection, of endearment, or as some others claim, of pre-eminent excellence? Did they imply in His case no closer relation, nothing more intimate and vital? By no such surface-thought do we sound their depth of meaning. That far more than this was implied and actually accredited by the assertion of Divine Sonship is evident from the course of the high priest in the trial scene before Pilate. If the sonship was to have been taken only in a moral, or, highest of all, theocratic sense, what occasion for his rending his clothes, and in horror saying, "He hath spoken blasphemy" (St. Matthew 26: 63-65)? It was in the natural sense—the sense of His Eternal Being-in which the Lord's answer to the words of the high priest, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," was to be taken, only could be taken. It was a momentous hour. No marvel at the verdict. Ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, "He is guilty of death," Canon Liddon states that M. Salvador, an accomplished Jew of our own day, has shown that this question of our Lord's Divinity was here the real point at issue, maintaining that "a Jew had no logical alternative to belief in the Godhead of Jesus Christ except the imperative duty of putting Him to death." The members of the Sanhedrim make this very point, "By our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God." In their own view, His sole criminality was in claiming to be a Divine Person.

No accommodative sense will explain this term of Divine Sonship so freely and frequently applied to Christ. The difference between Him and all mankind beside is strictly of essential nature and Divine constitution. No outward creative act puts Him and us on the same level. The title may not be thus indiscriminately applied to Him and to us. It is His exclusive property and right; and all that of Infinity lies in it and back of it, He shares with no one born alone of human parentage.

Doubtless, this is the pivotal point in all that claims to be distinctive Christianity. Everything in the person, and character, and saving merit of Christ; everything in the exclusiveness and permanence of Christianity, bearing along the hopes of sin-burdened humanity, turns, not on the matter of His pre-existence merely under any inferior and subordinate sense, but his absolute oneness of nature with God—distinct in person, one in eternal Being. Around the question, "What think ye of Christ?" gather all the interests of humanity touching the matter of a complete and adequate redemption. Was He beyond the bounds of time and creation in the profound depths of eternity, the Son of God in a generic and exclusive sense? "Was He so God's Son as no other is or can be, and therefore, He alone has the name THE ONLY BEGOTTEN?"

As to one aspect of our Lord's nature there is no longer the slightest uncertainty. However, by the Ebionitic heresy, only a transient, apparitional, phantom form was attributed to Him, making the incarnation a mere theophany, an illusory and deceptive appearance, there is now no shadow of doubt as to His thorough identification with the race He came to save. To this end, the value is incalculable of these evidences of His real humanity—birth, hunger, thirst, weariness, sleep, pain; and death itself. His lower nature was our own nature, "flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone"—received as we take it, and "not joined to Him in the way of an outward accident or appendage merely," as there will be occasion to show a little further on.

The term Son of man definitely expresses His related state towards man.

But this person existed antecedently in a Divinely related state in the aspect of Deity, so "that of the great progenitor of Israel He could say with absolute truth," "Before Abraham was, I am." One term is profoundly significant of His eternally related state in the Godhead—Son of God, consequently the eternal Son, expressive of a like generic relation on the Divine side as true and perfect God in this instance as true and perfect man in the former.

Against the phrase ETERNAL Son the sweeping assertion is made, that it is all nonsense. As has already appeared, father and son indicate a related state in a community of essence or nature. This holds in the Godhead no less than the family of man. The Baptismal formula is most pronounced in its recognition here of a threefold distinction, equally and eternally related. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST." A fair and honest interpretation must stoutly maintain that these are personal and not mere official distinctions. Were this only authorized formula changed to Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, it could not be accepted anywhere as Christian Baptism in its primal sense and significance. Its administration simply in a threefold office standing in a single Divine person is not according to its original institution and intent. Where any sufficient authority for baptism at all if the Divinely related state of Christ in the Godhead be thus systematically and completely repudiated? Whence His authority to issue such a commission, if the Divine Sonship ascribed to Him, claimed for Him and by Him, be but the purest nonsense-shadow without substance. Only on the ground of what He was antecedently "in the bosom of the Father" could there be anything like universal character and force in this solemn commission, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations."

What elsewhere is said of the eternally related state of the Holy Ghost, the third in this conjunction of Divine person,

must help us to a right understanding of the true and proper Sonship of Christ, This express declaration is made respecting the eternity of the Spirit. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God." This Eternal Spirit is declared the Spirit of the Father. Thus, "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you; He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies by HIS SPIRIT that dweileth in you." This Eternal Spirit is also declared to be the Spirit of the Son. Thus, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the SPIRIT OF HIS SON into your hearts, crying, Abba Father." Eternity, it appears, is a common quality, inhering alike in the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit. What is affirmed in this regard of one person is affirmed of each and all. "The Spirit is denominated Eternal; consequently the Father and the Son are Eternal. These terms indicate related states, which are thus Eternal.

On two separate occasions, both of the deepest significance, His baptism and transfiguration on the mount, marvellous attestation of His Divine Sonship was given, the voice of God making this explicit acknowledgement: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" and, as addressed to His inner consciousness, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." What was the precise import of this Divine message? Was it meant to assert simply an official character -the realization of the Messianic idea-or, as Olshausen and many commentators like him stoutly maintain, His "Divine eternal nature?" Both the unique message and the solemn transaction lose their deep significance if made to refer to anything but the personality back of that humble human form. Of our Lord's human nature as such, these astonishing words could not have been spoken, because it had no substance in and by itself. Only to and of the Divine person standing in union with the nature assumed were they and could they have been said. Dr. Kidd admirably says, in his treatise On the Sonship of Christ, "This Divine person retained, and could not but retain, His related state of Son to the Father or first person, after he had assumed the human nature into personal union with His Divine. Consequently the Divine nature of Christ subsisted in the related state of the Son in the Godhead, before He assumed the human nature into union with Himself. God, in the person of the Father, was, therefore, eternally well pleased with God, in the person of the Son. If our Lord be called the Son of God, He can only be so in that nature which possesses Sonship in the proper sense of the term. It must, therefore, be, with respect to His Divine nature, that He was, and is, and ever will be, the Son of God. The voice from heaven, on each of those occasions, concerned the PERSON addressed, not the appearance with which he was invested."

Says Bishop Wordsworth, "The distinct appearance of the Holy Ghost at Christ's baptism, together with the voice from heaven, 'This is my beloved Son,' brings out clearly the distinctness of each of the three persons in the EVER BLESSED TRINITY; and was an appropriate prelude to the fuller revelation of the doctrine of the Ever blessed Trinity, in whose name the whole world is now to be baptized, according to the institution of Christ."

Two phrases in the Epistle to the Hebrews set forth, with greatest precision and force, the Essential Sonship of Christ; "THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS GLORY AND THE EXPRESS IMAGE OF HIS PERSON." Whether or not, St. Paul was the writer affects none whatever its canonical dignity and authority, nor its positive Christological character and evident sacrificial sense. Never decided as to its origin, and, perhaps, now incapable of decision, nothing could be more pronounced in its doctrine of the person and atoning work of Christ. From the first note the ring is as clear as a bell. Of all the writings of the Apostolic period, it makes the profoundest arguments for His absolute Divinity, ascribing to Him in language most emphatic and direct, co-eternity with the Father, His associate and peer in almighty energy. Therefore is He greater than the angels—

they, creatures, He, Creator; they, simply "ministering spirits," He, Lord and Master, the proper object of their adoration and worship; greater than the prophets, even Moses, foremost of them all, they, voices simply of God's eternal truth, more or less distinct; He, Essential Truth, the Self-revelation of God; greater in priestly office and power than Melchisedec and Aaron; theirs, sacrifices ever repeated, and of a national and transient character simply; His, of force always for the sins of the world, Himself, in that mysterious word, ONCE FOR ALL, clothed with a universal and perpetual Priesthood.

The writer rests not his astounding claim in mere naked assertion. Step by step of the majestic argument, proof is furnished of the personal superiority of Christ in all these respects.

What Melchisedec, and Moses, and Aaron, and even the highest angel could never pretend to, is here attributed to Christ: "The Brightness of His glory, and the express Image of His person." The original is especially expressive and strong —δς δω απαύγασμα τῆς δοξης καὶ χαρακτήρ της ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. "His person" is not the English equivalent of ὑποστασεως αὐτοῦ. The earliest English versions had "substance," in a word, the deepest Essence; and hence, Essential nature and properties—Oneness of Divine Being. This is distinctly intimated in the foregoing clauses. 'Απαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, the splendor of His glory—gives us the idea of One eternally with God as having streamed forth, as a ray of light from the bosom of the sun wherein it was born, from the very "substance of the Father."

The nearest equivalent is the expression of the Nicene Creed "Light of Lights, very God of very God." A striking parallel is found in the Book of Wisdom. As radiance issuing from a central orb, so Wisdom is characterized as "the effulgence of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror or the power of God, and the image of His goodness." Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Theodoret are one in their interpretation of the passage as affirming in the strongest way possible, the co-eternity of the Son with the Father. The last named asserts, that He is "the everlasting Son of the

Father, as the ray of light from the sun is coetaneous with the sun, from whence it flows by a natural process." Nazianzen declares, "He is called Son, because He is of one substance with the Father and more than that, because He is from Him." The second phrase—zapaxry, ry, unordoew,—the Image of His Essence—gives us the idea of an actual counterpart in the same sphere precisely whether of things or of being, as the seal and its impression, as the die and the coin, as the mould and the effigy, as the sire and the son. Distinct from each other, and yet they are literally equal the one to the other. "Christ is both personally distinct and yet literally equal to Him of whose Essence He is the adequate imprint."

Says Dr. Kidd, "None but a Divine person can be an express representative of another Divine person in the Divine nature. Now, if, in any moment, the Son was an express representative of the Father, the Son must have been so from all eternity and must be so in self-existence. For, as the Father is eternal in His nature, that which expressly represents Him must, in like manner, be eternal; otherwise it could not be an express representation. It could only be a contingent and dependent representation of Him; but this is no representation of Him in His nature. For, the express representative of the nature must possess the express qualities of the nature of Him whom He represents. He, who is this representative, must be an eternal representative . . . Now, this quality of express representation is declared to inhere in the Son. As the Son, in the related state of the Son, He is the express image or representation of the Father-this quality is eternal; the Son in whom this quality inheres, is, therefore, Eternal Son."

Historically the Epistle to the Hebrews forms a stepping stone to the Christology of St. John—Antedating by a quarter of a century at least the writings of the Apostle—internal evidence showing that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple—yet in two points there is a striking resemblance, the essential Godhead of Christ in the opening verses of the Epistle at once reminds us of the golden prologue

of the fourth Gospel, asserting in majestic strain and with tremendous boldness and power, the personal distinction and yet generic oneness of God and the Word. The account made in the Epistle of the everlasting and all prevailing Priesthood of Christ brings to mind at once the sacerdotal prayer of the everliving High Priest (Hebrews, vii. 25), recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel. They are alike in the profound appreciation of the essential identity of the Word with God, on the one side, and with man on the other: He, who was "made flesh and dwelt among us"—man among men—being antecedently and eternally with God, and God.

There is nothing in human language so majestic and grand as the opening verses of the fourth Gospel—a wave from the great ocean of eternity to the shore of time. How well, from its profound insight into the heart and core of the Self-revelation of God has it been named the Gospel of the INCARNATION—the mysterious and necessary union of the Divine and human in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, constituting Him, and Him alone, the Saviour of the world and the fountain of life eternal.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The initial word of the New Testament is the same as that of the Old, with a marked difference. The Evangelist goes far beyond the historian of the creation, and plunges into the illimitable depths of eternityinto the profound secrets of the constitution of the Godhead, "The beginning" of the earlier writer marks the initial point of time and creation-God emerging into history and actual revelation. But back of all creative activity and epochs, St. John's "beginning" espies and asserts not merely the necessary pre-existence of the Creator, but still more profoundly a personal distinction holding in the essential nature of the Godhead. He thus defines the character and mode of being of the Word anterior to all time-relations, "The Word was;" ay more "The Word was with God;" and still more, not as a mere quality or attribute, as wisdom or power, but, "The Word was God." Reading aright this profound utterance, we get satisfaction and comfort on three points: primal and personal distinction in the Godhead, named God and the Word: not mere co-existence, but concurrent thought and purpose: and, thirdly, such entire oneness of being, as completely to shut out any and all idea of inferiority of nature—simply yet plainly affirming the true and proper Divinity of the Word, "and the Word was GoD"— $\theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$  not  $\delta \theta \epsilon \delta \zeta$ . The use of the article would have given pure Sabellianism, confounding the Word and God, and so contradicting the preceding proposition: The Word's

personal Being in Himself.

Clearly the eternal and essential Sonship of Christ was the thought in St. John's mind and faith. With this holy Scripture in manifold statements, and the entire work of redemption necessarily involving His advent in the flesh, stand in easy and natural reconciliation. And, so, what a flood of light His own full and unequivocal declaration pours from the Essential Fact! "God so loved the world that He gave HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." See, He speaks in a completely unique and peculiar sense of His relation to the Father. He claims to be not only His essential Son, but His only Son—the one and only Being in all the universe to whom the title in this proper sense belongs.

Then anterior to His earthly mission was He the Son of God. The filial relation began not first of all in His advent in the flesh. The Incarnation postulates a precedent Being. Otherwise it would have been altogether an absurdity for Him to have spoken of becoming the Son of God by being made the Son of man. Only because anteriorly the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON was He given and sent, could He have been given and sent.

In fact, but for such an antecedent relation of this essential character, how could our Lord have been in any position to have made the strong and strange avowal, "God so loved the world." Had He not been all and just what He thus claimed to be, how could He have made such authoritative statement of God; and presented, besides, the stupendous measure He gives

of the greatness of God's love. All He said would have been the sheerest pretension, apart from the fact of His absolute, eternal Being. "He could," observed a Bampton lecturer, "have had no authority to utter what He did if He was not what He said He was. And if He was not what He said He was, is not that absolutely fatal to the truth of the statement which He affirmed?"

Hostile thought suggests two explanations. Some read the title in a purely theocratic, and others in a merely ethical or moral sense. It is argued that, in the one sense, the Messianic ideal, which confessedly formed the burden of Jewish thought, and life, and faith, and hope, and struggle, utterly failing of realization in any princely character through the whole line of Jewish kings, came ultimately to its actual fulfilment in Christ; and that, as the true representative of this High Davidic or theocratic idea, He claims to be in such unique and exclusive sense the One Son of the Highest. Sufficient answer has already been made to this suggestion, in that the hostility of the Jews to Christ, even to the tragic end, was inspired and intensified, not by any mere Messianic pretense, but the shocking claim of true and absolute Divinity on His part.

In the other case it is argued that by pre-eminent and unparalleled moral character, par-excellence, standing on sublimest heights, to which no one else had or could pretend, Christ had shown Himself, beyond all of mortal born, the Son of God. The utmost of our Lord's claim of Divine Sonship, according to this view, is consummate moral excellence. Many Unitarian writers, from Channing down—noble specimens of moral greatness—have expressed in the highest terms their appreciation of this transcendent Genius for goodness, giving Him in such wise a sort of apotheosis—the adoration and homage due a superior moral Hero.

But, as showing in His own deep and abiding God-consciousness the sense of an original and unshared relation to the Almighty Father, going immeasurably beyond either theocratic or ethical sense just referred to, only observe this fact, that Christ

never says, in a common plural, "Our Father." Always it is, "My Father," your Father, forever putting Himself in a class by Himself; guarding, one might say, with most jealous exclusiveness, His absolute pre-eminence, His sole privilege and dignity. Take a specimen or two of this exceptional style of speaking of Himself. If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of "My Father which is in heaven." "So likewise shall My heavenly Father do unto you, if you from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." "But to sit on my right, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of My Father." "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven." "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." "Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to My Father," are the words of the risen Christ to the adoring Mary.

These are but a few of the passages in which the phrase occurs, with a single exception taken from the first Gospel. It would be an easy matter to multiply them. Only think of an ordinary mortal speaking to other mortals in this style-arrogating to Himself the absolute and exclusive right to God as His Father. It would be a piece of presumption and effrontery which other men would resent with unsparing indignation and scorn. And, in fact, it ought not to be at all otherwise on the part of Christ, if there be no more ground than you and I have for such marked and entire, such uniform and unequivocal separation of Himself from the whole world of mankind. It is only the possession of a Divine nature, unshared by all other men that reconciles us to the claim on His lips, MY FATHER. Ever stronger and deeper grows the conviction that this and this alone gives unity, clearness, coherence, and consistence to the inspired volume.

When St. Peter made prompt answer to the Lord's own

direct question." Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" " Thou art Christ the Son of the LIVING God," can any man for a moment imagine that this was an expherant utterance of the confident realization in Christ at last of the Davidic ideal only, filling the Jewish mind and literature, canonical and apocryphal, or an enthusiastic anticipation simply of that later thought which singles Him out as the flower and efflorescence of moral goodness and greatness-the one Perfect Man of the race? Read in the easy and natural way in which it was spoken, without the intrusion of a forced and foreign explanation, and not a thoughtful man but who will assert that the idea in the Apostle's mind, and taking actual shape in his hearty confession was the true and proper Divinity of Christ, the very germ, in fact, of which in the Nicene Creed was thus more fully explained: God of God, Light of Light, VERY GOD OF VERY GOD, BEGOTTEN, NOT MADE, BEING OF ONE SUB-STANCE WITH THE FATHER.

At the close of his Gospel, St. John gives this as its one aim and purpose, "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name."

At the close of a powerful sermon, Witnessing for Christ, Canon Liddon relates the following: "Something more than fifty years ago there was a small dinner party in London. The ladies had withdrawn, and under the guidance of the company the conversation took a turn utterly dishonorable to Jesus Christ our Lord. One of the guests said nothing, but presently asked the host permission to ring the bell, and when the servant appeared he ordered his carriage. He then, with the courtesy of perfect self-command, expressed his regret at being obliged to retire, but explained that he was still a thorough believer in the Divinity of Christ. Perhaps it may occur to some that the guest who was capable of this act of simple courage must have been a bishop, or at least a clergyman. The party was made up entirely of laymen, and the guest in question became the great Prime Minister of the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria; he was the late Sir Robert Peel."

### VIII.

## SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK-

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

# CHAPTER FIFTH .- (Concluded.)

#### A SURE STONE.

"I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: And when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren,"—St. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

#### SECTION VII.

## Christ's Sympathy for Peter.

It is an honor, and a glory, and an easy thing, at the present day, to be a member of the Christian church. But it should be borne in mind that every stone of this great highway on which it was promised His ransomed should go, singing, home to God, was built by the martyrs in sweat and tears and groans and blood. Only thus can true sympathy be had for the Saviour as well as His chief fellow-sufferer; for, in him, Jesus was likewise persecuted.

Was it nothing to the Master that His noblest pupil was buffeted by servants at the moment He was powerless to interpose in his defence? For, after that last command in the garden, "Let these go their way," Jesus, "as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before her shearers is dumb, opened not his mouth." His people were the body of which ("the church") He was the head, and He durst no more complain for them than for Himself. Was it no trial to the royal-hearted Son of David that the humble fisherman became entangled in this shameful net solely through love of

Him? If Peter had not returned and followed, or following, had stood without, none would have questioned him. Was it a small matter for the King of Israel to know that the bitterest foeman of His house would take advantage of His position as its hostage, and almost in His presence deliberately kneel and clasp and lock hard the cruel snare in which by His permission he had entrapped the feet of His eldest son? Was it no grief to Him, just as He was laying down His life for the truth, to be confronted by the father of lies with a three-fold denial in the mouth of His chief disciple?

Most fatal was the recoil of that day's work on Satan's head, for the blow that Jesus dealt him in the hour of Peter's need, was heavier than the one He gave him in His own behalf. Jesus loves the sheep of His flock more than their shepherd. How much more, then, did He love this one, the first whom He had found in the wilderness and lifted to His heart, carried in His arms, borne on His shoulders, and was yet to raise to His head as a crown of rejoicing! Malignity overstepped itself that day, for the depth and shame of Peter's fall only lent energy and strength to his deliverer. In him, Christ had (through His omniscience) a living, suffering, animating witness to the absolute necessity of His self-sacrifice by holding fast to that veriest truth—His eternal divinity—which Peter was denying, and which alone could save Peter and secure the Messiah's condemnation to death.

Did it add no sorrow to the suffering Son of God to carry this child on His heart in the last great agony—to feel that He could not be wholly born into the Christian church till He should have died and risen again—to know that He must indeed give His life for him, and yet not once be able with His dying eyes to implore him to fight the tempter, and hold fast to his faith? For Peter was not in the room with Jesus when he denied Him. St. John alone was allowed to follow Him there. "That disciple was known to the high priest;" and, presumably, had been chosen by Christ to witness and report the scenes of His trial, which at this time was private. "Peter sat

without in the palace," "in the court" with the servants and officers, "warming himself" at the fire which had been made in that open hall, "for it was cold." In vain the hardy fisherman "stood and warmed himself." No material heat could aid him now. "The Sun of righteousness" was sinking fast below the clouds of his horizon, and the chill of death was creeping over his soul. Not till Jesus should cross this broad hall would a golden gleam be thrown upon him, and then—then it would be—too late to prevent the denial.

"Lord, if Thou hadst been here!"

But much as he tried to avoid his questioners by going from hall to porch, and porch to hall, Peter was to deny the Lord, even as Paul was to persecute the infant-church. Thus, each of these apostles was to be prepared for his work in the world. In this way, by leaving willful men to themselves, "the Lord creates evil," \* in order that out of it good may come.

In His firm hold of this disciple—who confessed Him when others were silent, who clave to Him when many turned and ceased to follow, and whom He therefore would not leave to Satan and his own sinful nature—the Messiah must have borne Simon on His heart into the underworld. How else could Peter know so well whither Jesus had gone, and the work He was doing, when absent those three days from the body, as to be able to tell that "being put to death in the flesh," He was "quickened in the spirit; in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah?" †

And when Jesus returned again to the upper world and the joyous light of the sun, this disciple was still on His heart; for He hastened till they met each other, the loving and the loved, the saved and the Saviour. If this be not so, why should Christ have been seen first "of Cephas," and then "of the twelve." O rare constancy! O faithful promiser! Though

<sup>·</sup> Isaiah xlv. 7. Amos iii. 6.

Peter had forsaken and denied the Lord, to Him he is still "the first." When bringing in the covenant of promises and not of conditions, that of "Abraham" as the Virgin mother sang, the covenant with forgiven Eve whose sinless seed He was-the new, the second Adam appears first, of all the apostles, to Simon, and after him to the others. On that great day when the triumphant shout of the resurrection rang through the infant-church, and the joyful greeting passed from mouth to mouth-"The Lord is risen!" the like joyful refrain was-" And hath appeared unto Simon!" He, who could be seen of no one unless He chose, appeared first,\* privately, to Simon, and then was seen publicly "of the twelve!" And for what purpose did He appear thus in private to Peter, but that no eye might witness his repentance and confession, nor see the broken rock restored to perfect shape and soundness. And after this, what second great object had Jesus in view, when, "at the Sea of Tiberias," He "manifested Himself again to the disciples!"

#### SECTION VIII.

# Peter's Love for Jesus.

Judas neither believed in nor loved the Master, but Peter did both even when he denied Him. His faith had not failed. Jesus had prayed for it. It was as strong in Him as the Messiah and incarnate Son when he denied, as when he confessed Him; but it had been overlaid by fear. Faith alone is not enough to make the steadfast Christian. "The devils also believe, and tremble." And though a man "have all faith so

Of course the Mother of Jesus is not, in this instance, counted with the disciples, men and women. Of her it had been prophesied, "A sword shall pierce thine own soul also," and she would be sought first by her risen Son.

<sup>\*</sup>St. Peter—supposed to have dictated Mark's gospel—says "He appeared first to Mary Magdalene" (often confounded with Mary of Bethany) "out of whom He had cast seven devils." In an Easter sermon, bishop Andrews of the seventeenth century says that by this commission—"Go to my brethren, and say unto them, "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God"†—Christ made the Magdalene "an apostle to the apostles."

that he could remove mountains, and have not love, he is nothing." Neither is knowledge enough. The evil spirits knew that Jesus was the Messiah, and cried out, "saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And He rebuking suffered them not to speak." Nor, on Peter's part, was love wanting, that love which was to exceed all men's, and on which he so confidently relied, that he needed not to "watch and pray." And this love was not lacking in quality. It was always, and equally, unselfish and ardent. It was only deficient in quantity. It could not reach to the extent of dying with his Master on the cursed tree. And the measure of it fell short, because though he believed in and loved Him as true man and true God, he did not love Jesus as the Saviour of sinners. But this was for the reason that he had not yet learned Him as such.

There is no doubt Simon had been all his life a slavish adherent to the ceremonial law. In proof thereof, observe Satan's endeavor, later, to entrap him by this very means.\* And prior to this, in the vision of things "common or unclean," hear Simon's answer, "Not so, Lord," to Christ's command, "Arise, Peter; slay and eat." That he denied Iesus "with an oath" and "cursing and swearing," is no proof that he was not also a strict observer of the moral law. Much less is it an evidence that he was "habitually profane!" In that case, he would hardly have been, not only a partner with James and John in their trade of fishermen, but also their most intimate companion and friend. To Peter and John, especially, the beautiful language of the Psalmist could be truthfully applied-"We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company." That "profanity," on the contrary, showed how severely the devil tried Simon with the apparition of the cross, and proved to him (what Jesus meant it should) that he too must not depend, like the Jews, on the works of the law, nor on the fact that they were "Abraham's seed," and could say, "Abraham is our father." Though regenerated, he was not yet wholly "converted," as Jesus intimated when He warned him that Satan had desired to have him. And that lack of thorough conversion was caused by the need of a strong conviction of sin.

St. Paul said he "had not known sin, but by the law." St. Peter could have said he had not known the gospel, but for sin. Paul's experience of the law was to qualify him for preaching Christ's cross and sin original. Peter's, of the gospel, was to enable him to proclaim actual transgression and Christ's salvation. The mission of each, as of all the apostles, was first to "the House of Israel," to all "the elect" who were the heirs of the promise; and then to the world, to Jew and Gentile, bond and free, "every creature under heaven." The sufferings of Paul were severe and unremitting. The trial of Peter to fit him for work was short, sharp and decisive. Jesus, as man, had but to hide His face from him a little while, and as God to withdraw His restraining grace for a moment to convince him of his true nature by birth-not of righteous Abraham, but of disobedient Adam-and then Peter, forgiven "until seventy times seven," was ready to accepta nd preach the Lord, not merely to the Jews as their veritable Messiah and Jehovah, but to the whole world as its one, only, and all-sufficient Saviour.

Simon knew of the Baptist's loud testimony that Jesus was "the Lamb of God," and it may seem strange that he did not learn earlier that He was to be an atoning sacrifice. No doubt he had heard this, too, but hearing a truth and experiencing it are very different. The apostles had been told, distinctly, they would forsake the Lord. And Peter had been informed with a "Verily, verily," that he would deny Him. But none believed it. Even the messages brought by the women from the angels, and from Christ after His resurrection "seemed to them as idle tales." They were dazzled by the splendor of, and eager for, that earthly kingdom which they imagined Jesus was about to restore to Israel. Humble as they were, never were men more aspiring than those twelve chosen Galileans. They not only "disputed among themselves who

should be the greatest" in the new reign, but the brothers, James and John, endeavored by stratagem to secure the highest places therein; whilst "the ten were moved with indignation against them" for fear they might succeed. Notwithstanding the repeated teachings and warnings of their Master that His kingdom should not be an earthly, but a spiritual one, and attained only through suffering, the disciples failed to comprehend its nature. Those "twelve thrones" on which He had promised they should sit in the restoration, "judging the twelve tribes of Israel," were stumbling-blocks in their way; whilst "the keys" Peter was to hold, Satan used to charm him, the most princely of all in spirit, with visions of royalty, and a crown, and splendor surpassing Solomon's.

Even Judas, too, no doubt, mused like the others, and in his own imagination was to be lord of the exchequer when this unrivalled kingdom should be brought in. So far, the lack and love of money had made him mean and avaricious, but the care of an abundance of it in the future (he may have dreamed) would change him—a thief and a miser—into an houest and beneficent man! Like all his countrymen, he was disappointed by the unworldliness of the Christ. But, unlike his bribers, he had some grace, for he hastened to them and deplored his sin and threw their money at their feet.

Simon's views were erroneous, for he had not yet been guided by the Spirit "into all truth." And for the same reason his love was deficient. But Jesus accepted it, and kept him by means of it till he should know and understand the truth, and be able to keep himself. Hence, loving and trusting the Master, Peter, after having forsaken Him, shunned Him not, as did Judas the betrayer. On the contrary, he quickly returned and followed Christ into the judgment-hall. And, even though there, pursued by Satan, he denied Him, yet, when he heard that His grave was empty, he ran with John to the deserted tomb. Verily, "he that believeth shall not make haste!" Except, indeed, it be the haste that drives the offender to the feet of Him against whom he has sinned

and whose cause he has disgraced—there to confess his fault, implore forgiveness, and bow to the manner and measure of his punishment.

#### SECTION IX.

## Jesus Forgives and Restores Peter.

Over that first and most private interview between St. Peter and the Messiah, after His resurrection, a veil is thrown. No account of it is given by any of the evangelists. St. Luke merely states that when the disciples who were going to Emmaus turned back to tell those in Jerusalem that Jesus was risen, and had met them on their way, they were anticipated with the words, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." And St. Paul in summing up in one of his Epistles the witnesses of Christ's resurrection, also barely says that "He was seen of Cephas, and then of the twelve."

But the object of that meeting at the sea of Tiberias, which Jesus had in view when He bade the women direct His disciples to go into Galilee where they should find Him, is worthy of careful study. St. John mentions this assembling, but he alone records (in the beginning of his gospel) that when Jesus first beheld Simon, He said that he should be the greatest of the Christians. Then St. John is the very one who ought to narrate and record the fulfilment of that early promise; and at the end of his gospel is the natural place to look for it. It is evident he thought his book would be incomplete without it, and that he, as the bosom-friend of St. Peter, ought to note the supreme event of this gathering, for he gives it in minute detail. Seven apostles obeyed the call of the Lord, and seven being the number of perfection, they represented the whole Church; and what Jesus desired it to hear, every member of it ought to know.

It was not enough for the Head of the Christian Church to accept Peter's repentance, and pardon Him in private. Peter had confessed and denied Jesus openly, and openly he was to be reproved, restored and confirmed; for him whom the Lord loveth, He loveth and keepeth to the end, and He had first chosen Simon, and not Simon Him. The special object which the Master had in view when calling this meeting, was more than merely to restore the chief rock of His church, which Satan had dislodged, defaced and broken. It was also to give to Peter "the keys" that had been promised him at his confession, but were forfeited by his fall. In His own death the prophecy uttered many years before had been fulfilled. The great, living Stone, to which the Lord had called the attention of His people by the word, "Behold," had been "laid in Zion," and now the first of the twelve, which were to follow, was to be set in the presence of the brethren, and then the Son of God having finished the work He had been sent to do might return to the bosom of the Father.

"So when they had dined," (or broken their fast) on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias or Galilee, "Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these (love me)?"

"Simon, son of Jonas!" Had Peter known the force of those words, how his heart would have sunk. He was no longer "Cephas" the son of the Christ, nor "Peter" the son of the incarnate Lord. Having forfeited the new life, he was dispossessed of the new name. By his emphatic denial of Him, he had ranged himself with the Jews who rejected Christ, and could now claim no sonship but that of the man by nature sinful. However, there was hope for him in the fact that though guile had been found in his mouth, it was not premeditated guile. He had erred more through excessive fear, than want of faith and love. But Simon had yet to learn that "the fearful" as well as the unbelieving and unloving shall be cast out.

"Simon, son of Jonas, Lovest thou me more than these?" What a charge! He says not a word of the denial, but goes straight to its cause—insufficient love. And yet Peter answers, "Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee dearly,"

which is the strength of the word "love" as he used it.\* He was honest. He did love the Lord, and ardently. Like Job of old who held fast to his integrity, he could hold fast to his love. And Jesus knew it. "He saith unto him, Feed my lambs." Ah, Peter's trial would make him tender to the young and the weak, the ignorant and the fearful. He was now on the way to strengthen his brethren. And with this precious command the first denial was wiped out, and the first restoration was made in the eyes of them all. He was again "Cephas," and on the list of the disciples his name still stood at the head.

"He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" "Yea, Lord," Peter again replied, "Thou knowest that I love thee dearly." He might have appeared to boast in admitting that he loved Him "more than these." He might have done wrong in saying, "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended;" but his love he could not deny. He had given proof of it. Because he loved the Master not enough, he denied Him. But because he loved Him much, he repented deeply. And again Jesus responded, "Feed my sheep," or, "Tend and watch over my sheep." With this second command, the second denial was erased, and Peter was restored to his place as the chief of the apostles.

"He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me dearly?" or, "Dost thou indeed love me so dearly?" adopting Simon's warmer and more affectionate word.

A third accusation, seemingly, and all for want of love! Yes, for says St. Paul, "though I have the gift of prophecy,

<sup>\*&</sup>quot;It is to be noticed that in the Greek, in which St. John wrote, a different word is used for "love" in our Lord's question and in St. Peter's answer. That in the question—"Lovest thou Me?" is the word that would be naturally used for the love of man to God: that in the answer—"I love Thee"—is a word signifying a more, warm and personal love, such as that of the nearest relatives. (Com. on N. T., St John 21: 15).

<sup>†</sup> Com. on N. T., (St. John 21: 17).

and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, and have not love, I am nothing." Simon! Simon! had you but held more firmly to your love, come life or death of any kind, when Satan pressed you hard, you would not now be sick at heart and sore in conscience.

"Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time. Lovest thou me dearly?" He naturally thought the Lord was recalling, and the brethren remembering, that he had protested, "Though all shall be offended, yet will not I," and that notwithstanding this emphatic protest, he alone, at three separate times had affirmed-"I know not the man." But Peter was again at fault, because blinded by the pricking of his conscience. Could he have looked a little deeper into the Master's heart, he would have found His object quite another than to reproach and wound His dear disciple. He would have discovered that there was something more to be evoked from himself than loving protestations, no matter how sincere and deep. For, mark the words which this "third time" of Jesus, and this grief of Peter, has drawn from Simon -who, though he must never forget that he is the son of Jonas, is ever to remember that he is also the son of Christ-"And he said unto him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee dearly!"

Up to this point, Simon has not once said, "Thou knowest whether I love thee," but, "that I love thee." He has no doubt of his love for Jesus. Neither has Christ any doubt of it. But it begins to dawn on Peter's simplicity that there must be none on the part of the brethren. He is right. They too must be assured of its sterling worth, for he is to be their leader; though of this he would be the last to think. He only recognizes the fact that he must be restored to their fellowship also. The Master alone can, and must, confirm his words, or all hope is gone for him. And now, at the last extremity, he casts his own twice repeated "Yea" to the winds,

and trusting solely to Jesus to attest the truth of what he says, Peter cries from the very depth of his soul—"Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee dearly."

Marvellous is that act, though he observes it not, nor sees that Jesus was waiting for it. In the same breath, and with those same words, that he appealed to Christ-" Thou knowest all things "-he has made a spontaneous, free, full and unmistakable re-acknowledgment, in the presence and hearing of the brethren, of their Master's omniscience and eternity! To the delight of Jesus, and the confounding of Satan, he has virtually repeated the very same confession-" Thou art the Son of the living God "-for which he had been chosen and regarded as " more than these; " and, in spite of the Accuser, continues to be retained and valued as such. For the public reassertion of that truth which had made him the first and chief disciple, and which truth he had never doubted, Peter is now actually, and all unwittingly, being reinstated as the prince of the apostles, and installed as the shepherd and bishop of souls!

When Jesus "said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me dearly," Peter no doubt was grieved the more, since, in declaring, "though all shall be offended because of thee, yet will not I," he had seemed to intimate that the love of the brethren was less than his own. But still at fault, Peter did not see that the Lord's marked contrast of "thou," and "these," had been meant for a widely different purpose. It was intended to place them in the background and bring him to the front. Ignorant of his own worth, he was blind to the fact that by this grievous "third time" the Master meant equally to elicit from him, and impress upon them, his reconfession of that truth, which, though Simon had in effect denied it, still distinguished him from them and all others. Jesus wounds only to heal and to restore. He would not allow him, who loved and believed, to "make haste," nor to be "confounded," nor to be " put to shame."

And now He quickly "saith unto him, Feed my sheep," or

rather, according to the sense of the Greek word, "my dear sheep;" that is, "the souls dearest to Christ, those most truly His own."\* For Simon was frank and truthful and modest. He must have told the brethren that he had denied the Lord (since all were scattered where none could hear) but he never so much as claimed that he had been the first to confess Him, nor boasted that to him had been promised, and were to be given, "the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," And with that wonderful third charge, the third denial was blotted out, full restoration made, and the first rock of the church publicly established. Living, peculiar, precious and tried, it settled of its own weight into place, and was sealed, by the Builder of the temple made without han ds, a stone forever sure.

### SECTION X.

#### Simon is Further Honored.

In coupling as well as contrasting Peter and the brethren, by the words "thou," and "these," the Lord was judging and restoring all his apostles; for all had fallen when they were offended and fled and forsook Him; and each was to be reclaimed and installed a shepherd and bishop of souls. Those seven represented His church, which in many ways, great and small, continually denies Him and needs a Saviour. But now Jesus addresses Peter alone, for he alone had suffered and been stained by that offence of the cross—"accursed of God."

Simon's last answer, "Thou knowest all things," had so especially pleased the Master, that He immediately elevated him beyond his first dignity. But why does He proceed to add—whilst the others are closely attentive—in the same breath and with the solemnity of an oath: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest, but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." Does He

<sup>•</sup> Com. on N. T. St. John xxi, 17.

mean to say that Simon will again be tried, and again flee from the cross?\* Is He indeed predicting that, when old and gray-headed, he will a second time shrink from crucifixion, and have to be dragged an unwilling and pitiable martyr to the stake, and so, dishonor the Lord."

Let St. John, Peter's twin-brother in Christ, answer for them both: "This spake He, signifying by what death he should glorify God."

"He should glorify God!" Then St. Peter did not dishonor the Lord; and that "whither thou wouldest not," referred solely to the past. Jesus was really saying that, for His sake, Peter would gladly and nobly endure crucifixion, in spite of his lingering Jewish prejudice, and almost unconquerable aversion to the cross and "the tree." Having proved the truth of His words, "Thou canst not follow me now," He was both renewing and confirming the promise to him, "But thou shalt follow me hereafter," and also giving to the rapt and listening Church assurance of a steadfast saint!

Determined that not a shadow of the past, nor a cloud of the future, should dim the lustre of His infant church, the Christ sent its first representative—the man He loved and had died for, and who loved and would surely die for Him—to walk henceforth among his brethren with the authority of a leader in his hand, and the promise of a martyr on his brow. The leader's authority was to keep always in Peter's mind, and in theirs, his great confession. And the public award of a martyr's crown, with its warrant of willing crucifixion,† was to prevent him from lording over them, and them from reproaching him. Most wise judge! most gracious king! Judgment had begun at "the House of God." And now, behold how Jesus forgives and restores. Yea, rather, see how to overflowing He fulfills His promises!

<sup>·</sup> According to tradition, St. Peter tried to escape martyrdom-by crucifixion.

<sup>†</sup> Tradition says that St. Peter, considering himself unworthy to die like the Master, was, at his own request, crucified head downwards. This may be true, for it accords with his impetuous spirit: "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

550

But this was not enough for Him who exacts, and will repay, to the "uttermost farthing." The place dishonored by Simon's denial, He soon afterwards allowed him to honor by such a bold confession of Christ before the Sanhedrin, made in his own name and John's, as completely wiped out their reproach of forsaking Him. And prior to this, at Pentecost, He permitted all the apostles who "forsook Him and fled" to stand up with Peter, while he, in the name of them all, proclaimed Jesus to be their Messiah and Saviour.

#### SECTION XI.

#### Peter's Lessons.

Had the chief catechumen, Andrew's "own brother," learned the lessons the great Teacher set him? He knew before Christ's death, the first article of the Christian faith—that Jesus is highest man and God. Had he learned since, the second—that men are sinners and Jesus a Saviour?

Hear him, only a short time after the Lord's ascension, exhort his countrymen, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." And further add, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved."

What had Simon's trial wrought in his own case? Was he at last convinced of sin? Ah, on that memorable day of Pentecost, the Spirit of Christ wrought as much on Peter as on those three thousand who were convicted and converted by his preaching. Mark the energy with which, later, he reproves Ananias, in whose person his own sin of denying suddenly stares him in the face, and which he, as the head of the new church, is called to rebuke. See him uncover with a word the prompter of this sin: "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back

part of the price of the land?" Listen as he labors to make him see its enormity, for his was not, like Peter's, a sudden and unpremeditated lie, he had not been dragooned into sinning by Satan as the great apostle had: "Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." The Church had not laid it as a law on its members that they should have all things in common. The offering of their possessions was voluntary, and Ananias and Sapphira were not compelled to sell their land, and to lay the money at the apostles' feet. They were hypocrites, who had deliberately planned and executed this crime in hope of standing well with both God and the world. But the Lord would not tolerate a lie, acted, or unspoken, in His Church, for He had bought it with the absolute Truth.

Simon was at last convinced of the reality of a personal devil, of the existence of "Satan," who goeth "to and fro in the earth," constantly tempting men to sin, and against whom his Master had so earnestly warned him. At last he recognized and feared and preached this "devil," this "principle of evil," having personality and a name, this seeker of souls and bodies, to be delivered from whom their Lord bade them pray continually, of whose power he had been so incredulous, and to whose design upon himself he had been so fatally indifferent. Note how he warns his flock: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a rearing lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." Simon had heard that fatal roar, and felt the lion's deadly spring, when Judah's greater Lion quickly plucked him from his mouth.

Was Peter now persuaded that their Master's death was voluntary, necessary, and foreordained of God?

Hear him tell Christ's "betrayers and murderers:" "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified

and slain." "And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." Is this the man who said, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee!" Simon had heard those prophets often, but the Holy Ghost was not then witnessing to his spirit of the manner of Christ's sufferings and the purpose of His death. He had not then been born of the slain and crucified and risen and ascended Jesus, of whom he now says, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins."

And, lastly, was he reconciled to the mode of the Messiah's

death?

Alas, Peter oftener sees "the tree," than the cross; "hanging," than crucifying. Hark how he reproaches the Jews as he recalls the ignoble death of his "precious" Lord—"The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." And hear him also tell the Gentiles, of "Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; and whom the Jews slew and

hanged on a tree."

Christ, being guiltless of transgression, was not first slain, and then hung; but Peter, in deepest grief, can not see it otherwise. Hanging, in its most ignominious sense, after death, and in addition to the legitimate punishment of a transgressor, as the sign of an outcast, accursed of God and man, is the burden of his lament. Slaying, he could forgive. That, they did ignorantly. But that in the slaying they should maliciously contrive to hang Him, he can not forget. Truly, Peter did love the Lord, for his own sure prospect of dying on the dreadful tree, he, the remainder of his life, cheerfully endured for the sake of Jesus who was to him "the chiefest among ten thousand," and the one "altogether lovely."

St. Peter could only glory in the person of Christ. He could never, as did St. Paul, "glory in His cross," for he had never, like him, touched one of the lowest depths of sin. It was not his to do on the saints the very work of Satan-"strive to compel them to blaspheme," or, "curse the name of Christ." Nor had he studied the Jewish law at the feet of Gamaliel, and been conversant with the philosophies of the Greek and Roman schools. He was as unlearned in the mysteries of the natural man as the spiritual, and equally hard to convince of sin original and actual. Having been born an heir of the promise, and reared in obscurity, he had "escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust," and the commission of gross sins; and being of those happy ones in whose hearts the presence and companionship of the Holy One of God provokes no hostility, he found Him to be indeed a savor of life unto life, and not of death unto death. Hence, like St. John, who in all his Epistles and the Revelation never mentions the cross of Christ, he inclines, in his writings, to the Jewish figures of sacrifice, and speaks of redemption procured "with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot;" or, if he does see the cross, it is still in the Jewish conception of it-as "the tree"-"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree."

Peter, however, was to learn to love the cross, for had not the offence of it proved to be the stumbling-block which occasioned his fall, the mountain that hid the Lord from his sight and prevented his following Him? Therefore Jesus, when reinstating him and assuring the brethren that Simon should, and would, willingly suffer this death for His sake, at the same time gave him the remedy for his natural prejudice against it, in the words—"Follow thou me." Peter was to look only at Jesus, sacrificed for others, and thus joyfully accept Christ's manner of going as the most desirable martyr's death He could die. By this blessed contemplation of the Messiah as a Saviour, the wood, the nails, and the hanging were to fade

from his sight, or be esteemed as the welcome accessories by which he, who was so desirous to follow, should go to be "ever with the Lord." This "joy" the Master "set before" him, to enable him to "endure the cross and despise the shame"--the joy of being counted worthy to die the same kind of death as Himself. And, most certainly, his martyrdom was for the same cause—the teaching and preaching of His eternal divinity. That this discipline was effectual, can be seen in the alacrity with which, when the time arrived, he announced to his people, "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Iesus Christ hath shewed me." Childlike, impulsive and enthusiastic, in age as in youth, (the very qualities the Master chose and loved him for), it is easy to believe that Peter, who in the same breath protested, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," and begged, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head," did, likewise, when he had learned the secret of their Master's death on the tree, most gladly follow Him even there. By this time he was able to go, literally, "without the gate and the camp" and bear the "reproach of Jesus," for the Lord had removed its offence as "accursed of God."

Perhaps no small element of his willingness was the thought that he might thereby make some atonement for his sin. At least, the legend that St. Peter fled from crucifixion is provable to be wholly unworthy of him and of the Master. Forever engraved on his soul was that look of unfathomable pity, forgiveness and love, which, in his direful need, the Messiah and Lord on His way to the cross had turned upon him.

Of the Benjamite, Saul of Tarsus, the ravening wolf who hunted the flock of Christ even "unto strange cities," and who said, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the Name of Jesus of Nazareth," the commission ran—" For I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake." Whereas, on Simon Bar-Jona—who by the malice and intrigue of Satan was made to stumble and fall on his cross—Christ laid no heavier burden

than the happy duty of raising it, and bearing it aloft in the front of His armies, and proclaiming that Jesus of Nazareth who had been hung thereon was the Saviour of men—Jesus hominum Salvator. But of these two great apostles, neither would have been so active and untiring, nor so fitted to "strengthen the brethren," had not each in the course of his history, been, like Job of old and like Christ in the wilderness, sorely tempted of the devil, and severely tried by the Spirit of God.

### IX.

# NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

PRESENTERIANS. A POPULAR NARRATIVE OF THEIR ORIGIN, PROGRESS, DOCTRINES, AND ACHIEVEMENTS. By Rev. Geo. P. Hays, D.D., LL.D., with an Introduction by Rev. John Hall, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. William E. Moore, D.D., LL.D. New York: J. A. Hill & Co., Publishers. 1892.

Sold only by subscription. Price, in cloth, \$2.75.

A stately and tasteful volume of 536 pages, a credit to the author and an honor to the denominations and peoples of whom he writes. It is a tribute, even though unconscious and unintentional, to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, that every Protestant denomination seeks, in some way, to trace its origin back to the very earliest ages of Christianity. Presbyterians go back even to the days of Moses to find the origin of the office of Elder (Presbyter), and they find Presbyterians in St. Patrick, and in the early times of the Irish and Scotch Churches, as well as in the Waldenses and Huguenots of later times. But it was not really till the times of John Knox in Scotland, and especially the Westminster Assembly in England (about A. D. 1640), that the Presbyterian Church proper had its In a broader sense, however, "The Presbyterians" include all the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian Polity, and in this sense the author includes all the Reformed Churches that now belong to the "Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system," i.e., that hold to the parity of the ministry of Presbyters and a representative government of the same.

Our own Reformed Church, some eighty years older in its origin than the Presbyterian Church proper, and the Dutch Reformed,

belong to this family.

The work is well written. The introductory chapters by Drs. Hall and Moore are valuable additions to the book. But the wilderness one gets into when trying to trace the origin of all the divisions of the great Presbyterian Church! Those endless divisions are a blot on Presbyterianism. If the Presbyterian doctrine and polity are all that is claimed for them in the authority of the Scriptures, surely they ought to be able to hold all these bodies in some sort of unity. It is the weakness of the Presbyterian Church that it presents all these divisions. Let the movement towards church union of some sort soon put an end to them. Let there be one family and one church, from these endless and foolish divisions. We say foolish, because many of them date their origin to Scotland

and a past age, and the causes which divided them have no longer any force or reason whatever. They are mere dead fossils.

The work is very interesting, and we only wish a manual of our own Church (and we have one or more that is very respectable), might appear in a dress as inviting and enticing, as to its exterior, as this volume is. To this end we need to cultivate a wider circle of readers and better pecuniary support for what we have. When will our Reformed Church feel a just pride in our ancient and worthy origin and in our honorable history!

GENESIS, PRINTED IN COLORS, Showing the Original Sources from which it is supposed to have been Compiled, with an Introduction, by Edwin Cone Bissell, Professor in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. Hartford, Conn., Belknap & Warfield, 1892. Price, \$1.25.

This is a highly interesting and instructive volume. In it we have the text of the Book of Genesis presented in a variety of colors-seven in all-a different color being used for the matter from each of the Original Sources of which, according to modern criticism, the book is a compilation. The purpose of its publication in this manner is to show at a glance the result of the analysis arrived at by the critics, and thus to enable students more readily to study it and form a correct idea concerning it. In the Introduction, which occupies twelve of the seventy-three pages of the work, Prof. Bissell states that the scheme of textual analysis presented in the book is that of Kautzsh and Socin, which he holds represents as well as any, perhaps, the general conclusions to which those favoring the analysis have come as it respects the Book of Genesis. He then explains the use made of the different colors in the text in setting forth this scheme, and notes some of the chief grounds on which it is advocated, together with such other facts as may guide the intelligent reader in his independent investigations, and point the way to just results.

The work is in every way admirably suited to the purpose for which it is intended, and will amply repay careful examination and study. It will, indeed, be found a valuable addition to any library, and all persons especially interested in the critical study of the Bible owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. Bissell for its preparation, and to the publishers for the excellent and attractive form in which

they have given it to the public.

DARWIN AND AFTER DARWIN. An Exposition of the Darwinian Theory, and a Discussion of Post-Darwinian Questions. By George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. I. The Darwinian Theory. Chicage: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1892. Price, \$2.00.

This volume is devoted, as its sub-title signifies, to the Darwinian Theory, and presents a systematic exposition thereof. In a clear and masterly manner the views of the great leader of modern science on Evolution and Selection are explained, and the facts on which they are based, set forth, and in many cases strikingly illustrated by finely executed wood cuts. Throughout the work, moreover, care has been taken to avoid assuming even the most elementary knowledge of natural science on the part of those to whom the exposition is addressed, so that it can be read understandingly by any person of ordinary intelligence. For the correctness of its statements and explanations the name of its distinguished author is in itself a sufficient guarantee. To all who would acquire a true and exact knowledge of the teachings of Darwin, this work can therefore be heartily commended. It is, indeed, a book that ought to find a place in the library of every person who would be well informed as regards modern scientific research and thought.

The Gospel of St. John. By Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburg. In two volumes. Vol. II. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

We have in this volume the completion of Prof. Dods' Exposition of the Gospel of St. John, prepared as part of the series known as "The Expositor's Bible." In the first volume the first eleven chapters of the Gospel were considered, and in this second volume the last ten chapters claim attention. Both volumes are possessed of the same admirable qualities of matter and style. Neither can be read without profit, and together they form the best popular exposition of the Fourth Gospel of which we have any knowledge. Those whose duty it is to preach or teach the Gospel will find the work very suggestive and stimulating. Throughout it abounds in profound and impressive thought, happily, forcibly and beautifully expressed.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By the Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, B. A., Headingly College, Leeds. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

Of the Epistles of the New Testament attributed to St. Paul, that of the Ephesians is the least impassioned and the most abstract. On this and other grounds many serious and able scholars have come to doubt and even to deny that St. Paul wrote it. With these scholars Prof. Findlay is not in sympathy, but on the contrary, he believes that their conclusion "is one of those phenomena which in future histories of religious thought will be quoted as the curiosities of a hypercritical age."

In his Exposition of the Epistle Prof. Findlay shows himself possessed of superior qualities as an excepte. His scholarship is evidently thorough and extensive, his spirit discriminating and judicious, and his style clear, forcible and attractive. His comments, in consequence, are very helpful to a right understanding of what

the Apostle has written in the Epistle under consideration. They are, moreover, very suggestive and rich in profound and impressive thought. The work is accordingly a truly valuable one, and in every respect well worthy of a place in "The Expositor's Bible," to which it belongs. Such works can scarcely fail to promote a sounder knowledge of Scripture and a truer spiritual life, and ought to be generally read and studied.

THE SERMON BIBLE. Acts vii.—1 Corinthians xvi. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

The character of this work has on several occasions been heretofore described in the pages of this Review. It is therefore only necessary here to say that the present volume is possessed of the same characteristics which give their peculiar merit to the preceding volumes of the series. The sketches of sermons contained in it will all be found highly suggestive, and if properly studied will prove serviceable in a homiletical point of view. The references will also be found very valuable and helpful to those who would know what others have said on the portions of Scripture considered.

THE STORY OF THE LIFE OF MACKAY OF UGANDA. Told for Boys. By his Sister. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

In a previous number of this REVIEW we published a notice of the Life of A. M. Mackay, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda, written by his Sister. The present work, though relating to the same person, and also written by his Sister, it may be well here to state, is an entirely different book, prepared especially to stimulate missionary enthusiasm in the young. The story of Mackay of Uganda, as given in it, is exceedingly interesting and attractive. No one who begins reading it will be likely to lay it permanently aside before he has finished it.

Boys especially will find it captivating and spiritually stimulating and ennobling. It is a book which should find a place in every Sunday-school library. If more of this kind of literature were placed in the hands of boys and girls we should have more noble and heroic men and women; for the ideals which are set before the young have always a great deal to do with their future life. This fact, we fear, is not always regarded as it should be, or there would be more demand than there is for books like the one before us, and less for mere sentimental tales of fiction.